

SENATE.

FRIDAY, August 2, 1912.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

Mr. BACON took the chair as President pro tempore under the previous order of the Senate.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. LODGE and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 344) to continue the provisions of a joint resolution approved July 1, 1912, entitled "Joint resolution extending appropriations for the necessary operation of the Government under certain contingencies," and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

MILL OPERATIVES AT LAWRENCE, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. I present a brief letter from the mayor of Lawrence, Mass., making a statement in regard to certain conditions of labor referred to by the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER]. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF LAWRENCE, OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Lawrence, Mass., July 26, 1912.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE DEAR SIR: I desire to call your attention to a statement made by Senator POINDEXTER a day or two since in regard to labor in the city of Lawrence. He stated that black labor from the Cape Verde Islands was being dumped into Lawrence to replace the Irish and French-Canadian mill operatives.

As a matter of fact there are less than 50 Portuguese negroes employed in any of the mills in Lawrence to-day. It is common knowledge that Cape Verde Islanders do not perform inside labor, except in rare instances, but are acclimated by their own temperature to perform extremely hard outdoor labor, especially on construction work. It is admitted that there are a score or more Cape Verde Islanders employed on mill construction in Lawrence, but they are doing the hardest kind of outdoor labor, which the class of Irish and French-Canadians that live in Lawrence are not compelled to do, and when Senator POINDEXTER says that negroes are replacing Irish and French-Canadian mill operatives in Lawrence he is greatly mistaken.

It would please the people of Lawrence and the city government very much, Senator LODGE, if this letter could be read in the Senate and given as much publicity as the statements made by Senator POINDEXTER.

Thanking you again, I am, sir,
Very gratefully, yours,

MICHAEL A. SCANLON,
Mayor of Lawrence.

PETITIONS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of sundry citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to maintain the present water rates in the District, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. KERN presented the petition of Henry M. Williams, of Fort Wayne, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a second consecutive presidential term, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DU PONT. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 25531) making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 1006) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. JONES, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 7378) for the relief of James E. C. Covel, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1007) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5763) for the relief of William K. Harvey, alias William K. Hall, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1008) thereon.

SEWER PIPE AT NEW BEDFORD, MASS.

Mr. DU PONT. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 15509) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a sewer pipe upon and across Fort Rodman Military Reservation at New Bedford, Mass.

Mr. LODGE. I ask for the present consideration of the bill just reported by the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SHIVELY. Is there a report accompanying the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read for information, if desired.

Mr. LODGE. I can explain the bill in a moment. It is simply granting permission to the city of New Bedford to allow a sewer pipe through the grounds of Fort Rodman. It costs the Government nothing and is merely the necessary permission to allow them to lay a pipe, which is the city pipe.

Mr. DU PONT. I will state to the Senator from Indiana that the bill has been carefully considered by the Committee on Military Affairs, and the rights of the Government are fully protected.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A bill (S. 7409) to constitute a commission to investigate the purchase of American-grown tobacco by the governments of foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 7410) to authorize the Carolina, Clinchfield & Ohio Railway to construct bridges across the Big Sandy River and the branches thereof, in the States of Virginia and Kentucky; and

A bill (S. 7411) to authorize the Clinchfield Northern Railway, of Kentucky, to construct bridges across the Big Sandy River and the branches thereof, in the States of Kentucky and Virginia; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 7412) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Morgan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 7413) granting an increase of pension to William H. Moore (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 7414) granting an increase of pension to Louisa B. Highley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 7415) granting to the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. a right of way through the Fort Wingate Military Reservation, in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 7416) granting an appropriation for the destruction of predatory wild animals; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 7417) granting an increase of pension to Adeleine Minnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 7418) granting an increase of pension to William Box (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 22195) to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. SHACKLEFORD, and Mr. PAYNE managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116 to the bill (H. R. 25069) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, disagrees to the residue amendments of the Senate to the bill, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. SHERLEY, and Mr. CANNON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 5309) to amend section 3 of the act of Congress approved May 14, 1880 (21 Stat. L., p. 140), and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives agreeing to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116 and disagreeing to the residue

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 25069) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments still in disagreement and agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. CULBERSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the following joint resolution:

S. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to supply tents and rations to American citizens compelled to leave Mexico.

FOREIGN OCCUPATIONS ON AMERICAN CONTINENTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is a resolution coming over from a former day which is now in order. It will be read.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 371, submitted by Mr. LODGE on the 31st ultimo, as follows:

Resolved, That when any harbor or other place in the American continents is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military purposes might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States, the Government of the United States could not see without grave concern the possession of such harbor or other place by any corporation or association which has such a relation to another Government, not American, as to give that Government practical power of control for national purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not rise to object to the passage of the resolution, but I should like to hear from the Senator from Massachusetts a statement with regard to the real meaning of the resolution as it affects what we ordinarily know as the Monroe doctrine. Is it an extension of that doctrine as it has been generally interpreted or is it a mere application of the doctrine? I believe both the country and the Senate would like to hear a word from the author of the resolution in order that we may fully understand just what we are doing and just what notice we are giving to the world.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the declaration embodied in the resolution rests on a much broader and, if I may say, older ground than the Monroe doctrine. It rests on the ground which all nations have recognized and maintained of their right to oppose the founding by a foreign Government or by persons under foreign control of establishments at points which would threaten the safety or the communications of the Government itself.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will pardon me, while he is making this explanation there ought to be a quorum of the Senate present. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri suggests that there is no quorum present. The Secretary will proceed to call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Shively
Bacon	du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Bailey	Fall	Massey	Smith, Ariz.
Borah	Gallinger	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Bourne	Gronna	Nelson	Smoot
Brandegee	Heyburn	Overman	Stone
Bristow	Hitchcock	Page	Sutherland
Burnham	Johnson, Me.	Penrose	Swanson
Burton	Johnston, Ala.	Percy	Thornton
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Perkins	Tillman
Crane	Kenyon	Poindexter	Warren
Crawford	Kern	Pomerene	Wetmore
Cullom	Lodge	Reed	Williams
Cummins	McCumber	Root	Works

Mr. THORNTON. I announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. FOSTER]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] is detained from the Senate to-day on official business.

Mr. BOURNE. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is detained because of official duty. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I desire to announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] is unavoidably detained on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the call of the roll of the Senate 56 Senators have answered to their names, and a

quorum of the Senate is present. The Senator from Massachusetts will proceed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may repeat what I began to say, this resolution rests on a generally accepted principle of the law of nations, older than the Monroe doctrine. It rests on the principle that every nation has a right to protect its own safety, and that if it feels that the possession by a foreign power, for military or naval purposes, of any given harbor or place is prejudicial to its safety, it is its duty as well as its right to interfere.

I will instance as an example of what I mean the protest that was made successfully against the occupation of the port of Agadir, in Morocco, by Germany. England objected on the ground that it threatened her communication through the Mediterranean. That view was shared largely by the European powers, and the occupation of that port was prevented in that way. That is the principle upon which the resolution rests.

It has been made necessary by a change of modern conditions, under which, while a Government takes no action itself, the possession of an important place of the character I have described may be taken by a corporation or association which would be under the control of the foreign Government.

The Monroe doctrine was, of course, an extension in our own interests of this underlying principle—the right of every nation to provide for its own safety. The Monroe doctrine, as we all know, was applied, so far as the taking possession of territory was concerned, to its being open to further colonization, and naturally did not touch upon the precise point involved here. But without any Monroe doctrine the possession of a harbor such as that of Magdalena Bay, which has led to this resolution, would render it necessary, I think, to make some declaration covering a case where a corporation or association was involved.

In this particular case it became apparent from the inquiries made by the committee and by the administration that no Government was concerned in taking possession of Magdalena Bay; but it also became apparent that those persons who held control of the Mexican concession, which included the land about Magdalena Bay, were engaged in negotiations, which have not yet been completed certainly but which have only been tentative, looking to the sale of that bay and the land about it to a corporation either created or authorized by a foreign Government, or in which the stock was largely held or controlled by foreigners.

The passage of this resolution has seemed to the committee, without division, I think, to be in the interest of peace. It is always desirable to make the position of a country in regard to a question of this kind known beforehand, and not to allow a situation to arise in which it might be necessary to urge a friendly power to withdraw when that withdrawal could not be made, perhaps, without some humiliation.

The resolution is merely a statement of policy, allied to the Monroe doctrine, of course, but not necessarily dependent upon it or growing out of it. When the message came in I made a statement as to the conditions at Magdalena Bay which had led to the resolution of inquiry and which has now led to the subsequent action of the committee. It seemed to the committee that it was very wise to make this statement of policy at this time, when it can give offense to no one and makes the position of the United States clear.

Of course I need not say to the Senate that the opening of the Panama Canal gives to the question of Magdalena Bay and to that of the Galapagos Islands, which have been once or twice before considered, an importance such as they have never possessed, and I think it eminently desirable in every interest that this resolution should receive the assent of the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I think every nation recognizes and accepts the principle just announced by the Senator from Massachusetts as being the foundation for the resolution which is before us. The part of it which seems obscure to me is the attempt to create some relation between a private corporation or association of individuals and a foreign nation. I do not understand precisely what that relation must be in order that it shall fall within the scope of the resolution. Suppose, for instance, that a corporation were created to take some land in Mexico or in some other part of the world, and the corporation had for its stockholders only the citizens of a foreign country—of Great Britain, of Japan, of France, or any other foreign country—would that fact alone bring the transaction within the meaning of this resolution?

I would be the last to object to any announcement of our intention to preserve our own integrity, but I should like to know more about the relation which such a corporation must sustain to a foreign country in order to bring it within the scope of the resolution than is contained in the resolution itself.

It seems to me that we are rather vague and uncertain with regard to that phase of the matter. I do not believe it is wise for the United States to say that the stock of the company which owns the concession in or around Magdalena Bay should not become the property of the citizens of some other country without an additional specification as to the relation of those stockholders to their government. The mere fact of ownership ought not, as it seems to me, to be declared to be against the public policy of the United States.

It is true that the resolution says that this must occur under circumstances that indicate control over the corporation or the association so owning the land or water, as the case may be, but all that seems to be so expressed that almost any interpretation can be put upon it. While I do not intend to discuss the matter at length, I could not forbear expressing my opinion that this departure from any doctrine which I have ever heard announced should be so phrased that there could be no doubt whatsoever about it, lest we at some future time, having taken ground that we can not defend, may be compelled to recede from it to our own chagrin and humiliation.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I do not rise to make any special opposition to the passage of this resolution, but I do think we ought to have some fuller information respecting it before we act upon it.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. ROOT. It appears to me that the proper consideration of this resolution calls for the application of the thirty-fifth rule of the Senate. I therefore move that the doors of the Senate be closed for the discussion of this matter, because, in my opinion, it requires secrecy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a second to the motion of the Senator from New York?

Mr. GALLINGER. I second the motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this question behind closed doors, and the Senator from New Hampshire seconds the motion. Under the rule the galleries will be cleared and the doors will be closed.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 33 minutes a. m.) the doors were closed, and the Senate, with closed doors, proceeded to consider the resolution, which was amended, on the motion of Mr. LODGE, by striking out the word "national" in the last line, before the word "purposes," and inserting "naval or military."

The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate the unfinished business, the bill (H. R. 21969) to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal, and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone, when, on request of Mr. BRANDEGEE and by unanimous consent, the unfinished business was temporarily laid aside.

At 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m. the doors were reopened.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER].

The SECRETARY. In line 6, before the word "possession," insert "actual or potential," and in line 7, after the word "any," strike out "corporation or association which has such a relation to another," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That when any harbor or other place in the American continents is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military purposes might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States, the Government of the United States could not see, without grave concern, the actual or potential possession of such harbor or other place by any Government, not American, as to give that Government practical power of control for naval or military purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment just stated.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. LODGE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON], but I understand I have a right to vote in this case. I vote "yea."

Mr. DU PONT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. He does not seem to be in the Chamber. I therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. GUGGENHEIM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr.

PAYNTER]. I transfer the pair to the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GAMBLE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DU PONT (when Mr. RICHARDSON's name was called). My colleague [Mr. RICHARDSON] is absent from the city. He is paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Georgia was called). The junior Senator from Georgia is detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. SMOOT (when Mr. STEPHENSON's name was called). The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] has a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]. If the Senator from Wisconsin were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] and therefore withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia (when Mr. WATSON's name was called). The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. WATSON] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRIGGS]. If present, and able to vote, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

Mr. WETMORE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] and therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

I desire to add that my colleague [Mr. LIPPITT] is unavoidably absent, and is paired with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], and if present would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], with whom I am paired, was upon the subcommittee which reported this resolution, and in addition to that I am informed that if he were present, he would vote "yea." I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SHIVELY. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. KERN] is unavoidably absent from the Chamber.

I desire to say further that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS] is paired with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. WILLIAMS (after having voted in the negative). I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] did not vote. Is that true?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania has not voted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I must withdraw my vote, as I have a pair with him. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON]. I transfer it to the Senator from Maine [Mr. GARDNER] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BOURNE. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is absent from the Chamber necessarily on public business, and that he is paired with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OVERMAN. My colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on important public business. He is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP].

Mr. HEYBURN (after having voted in the affirmative). I would inquire whether the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed he has not.

Mr. HEYBURN. I have a pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], but I understand from his colleague [Mr. JOHNSTON] that if he were present he would vote "yea." So I will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. JONES. My colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber. If he were present, I am satisfied he would vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE. I desire to announce the pair of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—51.

Ashurst	Cullom	McLean	Shively
Bacon	Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.
Bourne	Fall	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Bradley	Fletcher	Massey	Smith, Mich.
Brandeggee	Gallinger	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Bristow	Gronna	Nelson	Smoot
Bryan	Guggenheim	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Burnham	Heyburn	Overman	Swanson
Burton	Hitchcock	Page	Thornton
Carson	Johnson, Me.	Perkins	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Johnston, Ala.	Pomerene	Townsend
Crane	Jones	Root	Warren
Crawford	Lodge	Sanders	

NAYS—4.			
Cummins	McCumber	Percy	Stone
NOT VOTING—39.			
Bailey	Curtis	La Follette	Reed
Bankhead	Davis	Lea	Richardson
Borah	Dixon	Lippitt	Simmons
Briggs	du Pont	Newlands	Smith, Ga.
Brown	Foster	Oliver	Stephenson
Chamberlain	Gamble	Owen	Watson
Chilton	Gardner	Paynter	Wetmore
Clapp	Gore	Penrose	Williams
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Polindexter	Works
Culberson	Kern	Rayner	

So Mr. LODGE's resolution as amended was agreed to.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BOURNE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of House bill 21279, the Post Office appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon asks that the Senate resume the consideration of House bill H. R. 21279, known as the Post Office appropriation bill. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator yield to me to introduce a joint resolution?

Mr. BOURNE. With pleasure.

RELIEF OF AMERICAN CITIZENS AT EL PASO, TEX.

Mr. BAILEY. I introduce a joint resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 129) to provide transportation for American citizens fleeing from threatened danger in the Republic of Mexico was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to furnish transportation from El Paso, Tex., to such place in the United States as each shall elect, those American citizens fleeing from the Republic of Mexico who are now or who may hereafter be temporarily supplied with shelter and sustenance, in whole or in part, by the Government of the United States in or near El Paso, Tex.

SEC. 2. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution the sum of \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, upon vouchers to be approved by the commander of the United States forces at Fort Bliss, Tex.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, we have just passed a resolution relating especially to Magdalena Bay, although general in its terms, that seems to me to be meaningless. We seem to be very greatly alarmed at the prospect of foreign citizens, Europeans or Asiatics, becoming interested in holdings in Latin-American countries. I do not think the resolution will have any practical effect as a declaration of national or international policy. I think it will have the effect of aiding some people who are seeking to acquire holdings about Magdalena Bay by terminating negotiations now pending for the disposition of these holdings to other people, and thereby affording an opportunity to those who are seeking it to acquire this possession at a lower price or, at least, without the competition of those who are now negotiating for it.

We seem to be very much concerned all of a sudden about a danger that is not, in fact, a danger; something up in the air; some remote possibility. At the same time, Senators have not been so careful of the rights of American citizens themselves in South America or in Mexico. Here we have before us an example. I have to-day received a telegraphic request or invitation, as other Senators have, to visit the city of El Paso to see and interview 2,500 or 3,000 American citizens who have been driven from Mexico in destitution. They have been compelled to abandon their homes and possessions, and we are now about to pass a joint resolution to take money out of the Public Treasury—and that joint resolution I shall vote for—to send these wretched people to some place. I do not know whether they have homes to go to, but to send them to some place of refuge at the public expense.

I can not forbear at this juncture from drawing a contrast between that anxiety in a particular case upon the part of Senators to protect the American people against a danger that is, at least, exceedingly remote in its possibilities while we remain silent when our own people, under our treaties domiciled in Mexico, are being ruthlessly mistreated, in many instances losing their lives, and are being driven from their homes in that country. We remain silent, except to authorize the use of the public money to transport them to the interior of the country.

I think we would do well if we cared a little more for the real thing that is confronting us than to lose our heads over

the possibility of a danger that hangs, if it exists at all, so far away on the horizon that we can scarcely discern it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, if it does not interfere with the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Texas, I should like to have it embrace such refugees as shall also be at Douglas and Naco, Ariz. But to be frank with the Senator, I am in hearty sympathy with his resolution, and I would not even suggest this amendment if it in any way embarrasses the measure. I am not informed of any refugees at Naco or Douglas, but there have been many coming through these ports for a long time. I have no doubt conditions exist in these cities somewhat similar to that in El Paso, but not in any way to the same extent. I imagine that if the joint resolution included these two cities, the fund provided will be sufficient to care for them. If the Senator gives his permission, I should like to have those two places included in the joint resolution.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, undoubtedly if the same condition exists at the points designated by the Senator from Arizona as we know exists at El Paso, the same provision ought to be made to meet that condition, and I have no objection at all. I would say to the Senator, however, that it would be necessary to provide the machinery by a further amendment as to the disbursement of the money.

The joint resolution was originally drawn providing that the vouchers should be approved by the commander, his name being stated. It occurred to me that if that commander should happen to die or be removed or sent to another place before the joint resolution was executed we would have a difficulty. So I simply provided for the commander, so that whoever might be the commander at the time could act.

Mr. GALLINGER. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The fort is at El Paso?

Mr. BAILEY. Fort Bliss is at El Paso.

Mr. GALLINGER. As to the vouchers, these men will have their railroad tickets and they will be on their journeys. What good will a voucher do after they are on their travels?

Mr. BAILEY. The officer who supplies them with money ought to take their receipts so that he may file them with the War Department as an evidence that the money was expended for the purpose of the appropriation.

Mr. GALLINGER. He will take the receipt when they get their transportation?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that ought to be done.

Mr. BAILEY. All the parties who come within the provision of the joint resolution are now being cared for by the United States through that Army post supplying them with provisions and doubtless with shelter. There are two or three thousand, and I regret to say that information comes even to-day which makes it entirely probable that that number will be augmented within the next 24 hours.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator kindly permit me?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. What class of people are these? Are they driven from mines and other occupations in Mexico?

Mr. BAILEY. From mines, farms, and ranches, and all employment wherever found.

Mr. President, I hardly think that the resentment which the American people are certain to feel against some recent occurrences there ought to be intensified by a recital of them on this floor, and I intended that the joint resolution should pass without any mention of them.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that I did not understand the point the Senator from Arizona suggested, but it occurred to me that probably the same condition exists to some extent at Laredo. I do not know whether it does or not.

Mr. BAILEY. If so, I have not been advised of it, and I doubt it. I am sure it is not so serious there, because the war now desolating our neighboring Republic is near and around El Paso, and the people now being driven by unspeakable barbarities and inhumanities from the Republic of Mexico are crossing into the United States at and near El Paso.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico. He knows all about the situation there.

Mr. FALL. I will state in answer to the question of the Senator from New Hampshire that the States of Tamaulipas, Nuevo Leon, and Coahuila, which are opposite Laredo, are the three States in the Republic of Mexico that are not in armed revolution, and the people who are coming into El Paso are from the lumber industry at Madero, where 269 women and children came out a day or two ago from the mines at Dolores and other mines in Chihuahua and from the American colonies at Casas

Grandes and other places. There are a dozen agricultural colonies settled by Americans, and they also come from the ranches, such as the Corralitos Ranch. I have here a telegram about the driving out those people from the colonies and mines of Sonora. The Senator from Arizona is correct about that. There are some of the American citizens from those colonies who are being driven out of Sonora, and they are coming into Arizona through Naco and Douglas. A majority of them are able to come across the country, and even those who come from near Douglas generally come out through El Paso; but some of them are arriving at Douglas and Naco.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I suggest to the Senator from Texas that I think we ought to amend the joint resolution with reference to the words "transportation to such place as he may elect" and insert in lieu thereof "the necessary transportation"? If it becomes a law there is no authority to limit the place by the War Department, because the joint resolution itself specifically declares that the transportation shall be furnished to such places as the party desiring it may elect. He may elect to go with his family to New York, or to Minnesota, or any other place in the United States. I think if you have a limit of only \$100,000 most of it would be utilized in transportation and very little for the immediate necessities.

I believe the Senator will agree with me that there ought to be some limitation or some one authorized to determine what would be an appropriate amount to expend for transportation in each particular case.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I am assuming that under the condition which exists there these unfortunate refugees will only ask to be sent to such places as they may reasonably hope to find employment.

If I believed that this generosity of the Government would be seriously abused I would readily accept the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota, but some of those people will go into Idaho, some to Utah, and some probably will go to other parts of Texas. I feel confident that in their present distressful condition they will not attempt to defraud the Government.

It is not a proposition to do more than to send them where they can again become useful to themselves. I think we are hardly authorized to hope that they could go back with safety to Mexico within a reasonable time, and with the harrowing experience through which some of them have passed they will probably never want to go back there at all. I hope the Senator will not insist on that amendment.

Now, Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] that if it should transpire that places in his State require this provision he can as readily pass it, and more readily, probably, than we are passing this joint resolution; and as he does not know that there is any call for assistance there, I suggest that he leave this to pass and rely upon the willingness of the Senate to respond to his call whenever he finds it necessary to make it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I will adopt the suggestion of the Senator from Texas; but I have in my hand a telegram which led me to make the suggestion. I will not read it for the same reason that the Senator from Texas refrained from stating conditions there, but I know from where the telegram comes that the people of whom the sender of the wire speaks live in the northern part of Arizona, and they would come into the United States either at Naco or Douglas. I said Nogales, but I meant the town of Naco. The refugees of whom this man telegraphs lived in Arizona, as I understand; but adopting the suggestion of the Senator from Texas I shall inquire into the matter. I expect, as he already guarantees, and I know, that the Senate in a case of like necessity will likewise respond to it.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask what there is about the situation that we need to treat it so tenderly. If it be a fact that American citizens are passing through harrowing scenes in Mexico, that they are being abused and outraged in contravention of our treaty with Mexico, and their rights, if they are being driven like cattle, barefooted and half clothed, out of Mexico, leaving them in such a state of destitution that we must appeal to the Public Treasury to relieve them, what is there about it that should be treated—

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. I will say to the Senator frankly that there are some things I should like to say, there are some things I

have been on the point of saying, not only as to the treatment of these people who have fled from Mexico, but as to the treatment of citizens of Texas by the Army of the United States; but I have refrained from doing so, because the Senate has already authorized the appointment of a committee to inquire into this situation, and I thought it better to withhold my observations until that committee has concluded its work and made its report. If that committee finds conditions such as they have been represented to me, then I will join the Senator from Missouri in such plain speech as will be entirely satisfactory to the most warlike disposition.

Mr. STONE. To what committee does the Senator allude?

Mr. BAILEY. The Senate authorized the Committee on Foreign Relations to appoint a subcommittee to inquire into this situation.

Mr. STONE. To inquire, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. BAILEY. And, of course, it will, after inquiring, report to the Senate. That subcommittee has already been designated. I applied to the honorable chairman of it this morning to ascertain when he would proceed with the work, and made some suggestions, and when assured by him that the committee intended to proceed without any lack of diligence, I concluded to postpone what I might otherwise have said now.

Mr. STONE. Is that the committee presided over by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. BAILEY. It is.

Mr. STONE. Well, that committee, as I understand, is authorized particularly to investigate whether any citizen or person owing allegiance to the United States had been engaged in fomenting rebellion in Mexico. The newspapers have contained statements that Americans were interested in financing and supporting and organizing revolutionary movements in Mexico, and this committee was appointed to find out whether that was true, and, if so, to what extent. I do not understand that the committee has been appointed to make inquiry as to the wrongs done by Mexicans to American citizens; that is outside of the purposes for which that committee was appointed. I think it would be well to have that committee or some other committee authorized to extend the inquiry along that line, so that we might have some authentic data, some sound, reliable information respecting the misconduct of Mexicans in their treatment of American citizens lawfully domiciled in that Republic. Whatever others may say or think or do, for one I intend to continue to register my protest against the Senate and the other House looking on at this spectacle that should bring a blush of shame to every American cheek and remaining silent in the presence of it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I want to say, and I will detain the Senate no longer than it is necessary to say, that if the committee prosecuting this investigation shall ascertain the condition to be as it has been represented to me, the American Congress will be required to take cognizance of it; but I do not myself feel at liberty to comment upon the things which have been repeated to me, though, in some instances, they have come from correspondence with the most reputable citizens of Texas. I have no shadow of doubt that the statements which they have made are believed by them to be absolutely true. Neither do I doubt—and I question the propriety of saying even this much—that there is now a deliberate and systematic attempt on the part of certain persons to force an intervention upon the United States; but surely Congress will not take a step so serious as that until it is possessed of all the information obtainable and has obtained that information through one of its own committees.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, it was not from any fear of the responsibility involved in the matter, nor was it from any lack of a desire to protect American citizens to as full a degree as would the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], or any other Senator on this floor, that I refrained from reading the telegram. The person who sent it was many miles away from the scene of the trouble. The information he had was from reports of which I personally can know nothing. I do not wish to read sensational telegrams to the Senate, which, after investigation, might possibly prove to be not altogether correct. I repeat it was not from any fear of saying anything which might be necessary here or elsewhere to protect an American citizen in his rights, not only in Mexico, but in any other country, which prevented me from reading the telegram. Before this session comes to its long-delayed end it may become necessary to read not only the telegram now in my hands, but many others, in order that some action may be taken by Congress to relieve the horrible conditions now prevailing in our sister Republic. That something must be done either by the State Department or by Congress at an early date has gone beyond the necessity of argument or further debate.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 21279) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, I will say for the information of Members of the Senate that if they will turn to page 53 of the "information print" of the bill on their desks they will see where the Secretary will now resume the reading.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill, beginning on page 37, line 7, and read to the end of line 13, page 37.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon in charge of this bill, if his purpose is to have a session of the Senate to-night? I will state the reason I make the inquiry. There are some Senators who are very much interested in the provision of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives in connection with national aid to Government-used roads who will be compelled to be absent this evening and possibly to-morrow. That provision, with the amendment of the Senate committee, has now been reached. If it is not purposed to have a session of the Senate to-night, I should like to have this amendment go over until Monday. I am very much interested in it, as are other Senators who are cooperating with me, and we are desirous of having the House provision providing aid to roads retained in the bill.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, in reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Virginia, I beg to state that I consider it of the utmost importance that we should, in view of the large amount of appropriations carried in it, expedite the passage of this bill as rapidly as possible. It is my purpose to ask the Senate to hold a session this evening in order to continue the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SWANSON. Is it the purpose of the Senator to ask the Senate to take a recess, say, at 6 o'clock?

Mr. BOURNE. Yes; until 8 or 8.30.

Mr. SWANSON. Suppose the Senator now submits the request to see if consent can be obtained. Then we shall know whether the question will be considered to-night and whether we shall have to remain here.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, in order to determine the matter, I will ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess at 6 o'clock until 8.30 this evening.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Say, 8 o'clock.

Mr. BOURNE. Very well; until 8 o'clock this evening.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent that at 6 o'clock the Senate take a recess until 8 o'clock, when the Senate shall reconvene. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, under the subhead "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," on page 37, after line 14, to strike out:

That for the purposes of this act certain highways of the several States, and the civil subdivisions thereof, are classified as follows:

Class A shall embrace roads of not less than 1 mile in length, upon which no grade shall be steeper than is reasonably and practically necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, well drained, with a road track not less than 9 feet wide composed of shells, vitrified brick, or macadam, graded, crowned, compacted, and maintained in such manner that it shall have continuously a firm, smooth surface, and all other roads having a road track not less than 9 feet wide of a construction equally smooth, firm, durable, and expensive, and continuously kept in proper repair. Class B shall embrace roads of not less than 1 mile in length, upon which no grade shall be steeper than is reasonably and practically necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, well drained, with a road track not less than 9 feet wide composed of burnt clay, gravel, or a proper combination of sand and clay, sand and gravel, or rock and gravel, constructed and maintained in such manner as to have continuously a firm, smooth surface. Class C shall embrace roads of not less than 1 mile in length upon which no grade shall be steeper than is reasonably and practically necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, with ample side ditches, so constructed and crowned as to shed water quickly into the side ditches, continuously kept well compacted and with a firm, smooth surface by dragging or other adequate means, so that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles at all times. That whenever the United States shall use any highway of any State, or civil subdivision thereof, which falls within classes A, B, or C, for the purpose of transporting rural or star-route mail, compensation for such use shall be made at the rate of \$25 per annum per mile for highways of class A, \$20 per annum per mile for highways of class B, and \$15 per annum per mile for highways of class C. The United States shall not pay any compensation or toll for such use of such highways other than that provided for in this section, and shall pay no compensation whatever for the use of any highways not falling within classes A, B, or C: *Provided*, That in calculating or otherwise ascertaining the distance that mail is transported over any highway, such distance shall be measured or calculated in only one direction, and only one use of or travel over any such highway, or any part thereof,

on any one trip by a carrier using the same, shall be considered. That any question arising as to the proper classification of any road used for transporting rural or star-route mail shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. That the compensation herein provided for shall be paid at the end of each fiscal year by the Treasurer of the United States upon warrants drawn upon him by the Postmaster General to the officers entitled to the custody of the funds of the respective highways entitled to compensation under this act under and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General: *Provided, however*, That no payment shall be made under the provisions of this paragraph for the use of any privately owned or toll road. The provisions of this paragraph shall go into effect on the 1st day of July, 1913.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

That a joint committee shall be appointed, composed of three members of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and three members of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to be designated by the respective chairmen thereof, to make an inquiry into the subject of Federal aid in the construction of highways and report at the earliest practicable date, and said committee shall have power to employ such clerical and stenographic assistance as may be necessary and conduct hearings, and for the payment of the expenses of such inquiry there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$5,000, to be paid upon vouchers signed by the chairman of said committee.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, a number of Senators who are very much interested in this question desired that it should go over, as it is a contested amendment; but, as the chairman of the committee desires that we shall proceed with it now and dispose of it, I shall offer no objection. I desire to make a very short statement to the Senate regarding this amendment and why I think the House provision should be retained in the bill.

This provision was adopted by the House of Representatives by a vote, I believe, of 240 to 89. Consequently it has the indorsement of that body by a vote of practically 3 to 1. It was considered in all of its stages in the House of Representatives. It was considered by the Committee on Agriculture of that body, and reported by that committee to the House, and then adopted by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and made a part of the Post Office appropriation bill in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, we are now confronted with the proposition whether the Federal Government shall or shall not extend aid for the development, improvement, and construction of highways. I do not propose to make any elaborate address as to whether this should or should not be done. I have previously addressed the Senate in advocacy of the National Government extending Federal aid toward the construction of highways. Whatever may be the views of some, it is a question that must inevitably be met, and one that can not be shirked. The time has arrived, or will very soon arrive, when the people of the United States will demand that the Federal Government shall extend proper aid for the construction, improvement, and development of highways.

The constitutional question involved in this matter has been eliminated, because the provisions carried in the House bill limits the appropriation to rural delivery routes and star routes used by the Government. Hence I will not discuss that question, which has been repeatedly debated, both in the other House and in the Senate.

An amazing condition in connection with public roads exists in the United States. While the United States has succeeded in everything else and almost established a primacy, it is cursed to-day with the worst highways of any civilized nation in the world. We have improved our rivers; we have more miles of railroad than any other country; we have better harbors; we are supreme in finance; and yet in the construction of highways the United States to-day is the most backward of all civilized nations. The question naturally presents itself why this Nation—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator, perhaps, is entirely accurate in his characterization of the highways of the United States. As compared with Germany and England and France our area is so much larger and the number of miles of road so much greater that, of course, our highways are not up to the German, French, or English standard of perfection; but I apprehend that under the great movement now going on in the States for the betterment of roads we probably have as many miles of first-class road in the United States as any other nation in the world. I think we are doing pretty well in that respect; but I sympathize with the Senator in his desire for good roads, and if anything can constitutionally be done to extend the system of highway improvement by the National Government, very likely it ought to be brought about.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, out of the 2,155,000 miles of road in the United States less than 200,000 miles are macadam or hard-surface roads. Not one mile in ten in this country is

other than an ordinary dirt road. There is no country in the world so rich, potential, strong, and up to date as is the United States, and yet there is no other civilized country where there is such a disparity between the number of miles of good road and the number of miles of bad road.

Mr. GALLINGER. No, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, while an equal number of miles of good roads are to be found in European countries they have not such great stretch of highway to be improved.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I will say that in proportion to population, in proportion to wealth, in proportion to needs, in proportion to business, in proportion to the commerce passing over the roads, those of the United States are recognized as the worst of any civilized country. Now, the question confronts us, Why does such a condition exist? It is not because of a lack of necessity for good roads. I believe the economic loss to the United States on account of bad roads to-day is greater than from any other source. So, the present condition of the roads of the United States can not be because of a lack of necessity or a lack of profit and benefit that would accrue from good roads. The only reason for the backward condition of the roads of the United States is the bad system of road construction that has existed in this country, in comparison with the systems prevailing in other nations. The same condition that prevails here existed in England until the eighteenth century. Why? Because she had the same method of constructing and improving and keeping in repair her roads that exists in the United States to-day. Until the eighteenth century the roads in England were constructed, improved, and kept in repair entirely by local expenditure and local effort. English roads were noted for their wretchedness and their mud. The roads were so bad even in the vicinity of London that they were almost impassable. Recognizing this, in the eighteenth century England departed from her road law which had been in force from 1555, and commenced a system of road construction under which the nation united with the local authorities in the various counties. France did the same thing. There has been no construction or improvement of roads in any nation except where the burden has been fairly and justly distributed between the central government and the local communities.

New York had no good roads of any consequence until the State government endeavored by its laws to distribute the burden—the State paying so much, the county so much, and the local authorities so much for the improvement of the State roads. In that way a system of good roads was rapidly developed in New York. The same is true of New Jersey, Massachusetts, Virginia, and Indiana. Consequently it is evident that we must have money from a central authority, from a general treasury, State or national, in order to accomplish the results which have been accomplished in some of the States and in other nations.

The question confronts us whether the Federal Government should do anything. Travel over the roads is national, State, and local. Modern conditions are such that no road is used exclusively by the people who live immediately along its course or by the people of the county or the State, but it is used and enjoyed by all the people. Consequently the money to construct the roads and to keep them in repair should be paid from some central source, as the roads are used by the people of all the Nation. With this in view, the Federal Government has heretofore appropriated money for this purpose. It appropriated \$14,000,000 for road construction before the Civil War, and it gave 200,000,000 acres of land to increase facilities of transportation by railroad, to benefit towns and communities by providing cheap transportation. There are many communities that are just as much interested in the common road as they are in railroads, and the same reason for extending aid in the one case exists in the other.

When a Government comes to extend aid for roads there are two ways by which it can be done: It can furnish the money and construct the road itself, and it can utilize its own engineers and officers of construction, or it can aid, stimulate, and lend inducement to the local authorities to do the work of road construction and improvement.

Many bills have been introduced in Congress calling for different methods of bringing about this result.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. BOURNE. I should like to ask the Senator whether, in his opinion, the adoption of the House provision will be an incentive for the construction of any more new roads?

Mr. SWANSON. I think it will; but I will get to that at the proper time.

Mr. President, the House provision has been drafted with this idea: Instead of the Government appropriating millions of dollars to construct roads itself, instead of having its own engineers build and improve the roads, it is proposed to appropriate a certain amount of money for two purposes—first, to pay for the use the Government makes of the roads, and, second, to stimulate and encourage the local authorities and the people in the various States and counties to improve their roads and keep them up to a certain standard fixed by the National Government. So the House bill provides that all roads used by the United States Government for star-route purposes and for rural-delivery purposes shall be classified. This includes about 1,200,000 miles of road, which it is proposed shall be classified, so that a road used by a star-route contractor or rural-delivery carrier, if it is a macadam road and measures up to certain requirements, will receive from the Government \$25 a mile per year as an inducement to keep the road in good repair and condition. For the use of a hard-surface road, made of burnt clay or otherwise, the United States will pay \$20 per mile. For the use of dirt roads measuring up to certain requirements, for instance, that they shall be well drained by ditches, shall be dragged, and shall be kept in reasonably passable condition, the Government will pay \$15 a year per mile.

Now, let us see what the total expenditure will be. It can not exceed \$18,000,000 a year for all the miles of road used by star routes and the Rural Delivery Service in the United States to-day. It would not amount to that until the roads had been improved sufficiently and kept in such condition as to entitle them to receive payment from the Government.

As to the condition of the macadam and hard-surface roads there can be no controversy. The greatest objection that has been urged to this bill has been because it makes a provision of \$15 a mile for the use of dirt roads. The apprehension has been felt by some that that will be simply a waste of money. Let us see whether it will or not. In order to obtain this money that road must be used by a star-route contractor or rural carrier for 12 months. What are the requirements before the money can be paid? First, that the road must be in a certain condition for one year and it must be used by the Government before the money can be claimed. What are the conditions for class C roads as provided in the bill?

Class C shall embrace roads of not less than 1 mile in length upon which no grade shall be steeper than is reasonably and practically necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, with ample side ditches, so constructed and crowned as to shed water quickly into the side ditches, continuously kept well compacted and with a firm, smooth surface by dragging or other adequate means.

And follows the condition:

So that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles at all times.

Now, Mr. President, if the dirt roads in the United States were brought to that condition within 12 months from now, were well drained, ditched, and dragged, the Government of the United States could easily afford to pay \$18,000,000 that this bill carries to get them in that condition.

You get rid of the holes in the roads; you compel them to be drained; you compel them to have a smooth surface; you compel their continuous dragging; you compel them to be ditched; you compel them to be reasonably passable at all times during the entire year. The bill provides that this condition must exist 12 months before the money is paid.

Now, what would be the result of this appropriation? It is not effective till 1913. From now until the 1st of July, 1913, every road supervisor in the United States will have this proposition submitted to his consideration: Improve your dirt roads and make them macadam roads or make them hard surface and you will get twenty-five or twenty dollars per mile per year for their use, as the case may be. Improve your dirt roads, drain them well, fill up the holes, drag them, keep them passable during 12 months, and at the end of 12 months, in 1914, you can get \$15 a mile for their being in that condition.

Mr. President, people laugh at dirt roads. For the next 25 years three-fourths of the traffic of this country must be hauled over dirt roads. It is estimated, from the present cost of hauling, that the United States loses \$250,000,000 a year on account of the condition of its roads. It is estimated that 90 per cent of all the internal commerce of the United States passes over the roads an average of 9 miles before it reaches the railroads or harbors for water transportation. Consequently, for the next 25 years at least, we have to depend largely upon the condition of the dirt roads to get better and cheaper transportation; and better and cheaper transportation mean great reduction in the cost of living.

There is this stimulation to this bill. It encourages every community to change its dirt roads to hard-surface roads. It encourages every community to improve its dirt roads and make

them passable and make them good. It has been estimated that it will take from thirty to forty or forty-five dollars per annum to keep a dirt road in splendid condition, to keep it smooth, to keep it drained, to keep the mudholes filled, and the United States would be paying about one-third the expense of keeping those roads in that condition.

One advantage of this bill is that all of its benefits do not go entirely to those who will have macadam or splendidly constructed roads. They go to every hamlet, to every village. They give an encouragement and a stimulus to every part of the United States to improve its roads and to keep them in good condition.

Now, no other bill that I have seen introduced has this advantage, of benefiting and stimulating every local community and all sections of the country.

The Senator from Oregon asked me whether I thought new roads would be created because of this bill. Roads are created as they are needed for transportation and traveling purposes.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. In just a moment. But when they are created, then it is necessary to keep them in order.

Now, the advantage of this is that it will improve at once present roads. It will also increase the number of roads where they are needed, because when roads are increased and utilized by the Government this will become operative and the new roads will receive the same pay that other roads receive which are already in existence.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BOURNE. Is it not true that, under the provisions of the bill no rental for Government usage can be paid by the Government except for its usage by the rural carrier?

Mr. SWANSON. The rural carrier and the star route, both.

Mr. BOURNE. It includes both?

Mr. SWANSON. It includes both. It includes about 1,180,000 miles of road out of the 2,150,000. In other words, that includes more than half of all the roads in the United States, and that one-half are the roads mostly needed and over which most of the traffic and travel would go.

Mr. BOURNE. But if the Senator will allow me, I do not see where the incentive under the Shackleford measure or the House bill lies for the construction of new roads. I do see where preparation is partially made for the maintenance of roads already used by the Government on the rural and star routes, amounting to over a million miles.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, some wise road builders in the United States who have given the subject great study say that the curse of the United States to-day is too many roads not kept in order, and that we would get along better if we had less roads and put them in order. The problem in the United States is not the building of new roads as much as it is to get the roads into a passable and good condition.

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield, and to whom?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield now to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been reading the provision carefully within the last two or three minutes, and I want to make one or two practical suggestions to the Senator from Virginia. I am in sympathy with the general proposition, but will there not be a divided responsibility as between the municipality or the State and the General Government in maintaining these roads?

Now, Mr. President, as an illustration, in my own little State we have made very large appropriations from the State treasury—a million dollars at one time—for the construction of good roads, and we have built some roads costing five or six thousand dollars a mile. It takes a very considerable amount of money to keep them in repair. For instance, the oiling of those roads, I think, costs three or four hundred dollars a mile, and we frequently resort to that expedient.

Now, if the United States Government is going to put only \$25 a mile into those roads—and that is to be a separate fund—and the State or the municipality is going to expend money for the same purpose, it seems to me there would be a conflict of authority, and that very little good would be done.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from New Hampshire is correct, and this bill is drawn so as to get rid of the very objection urged by the Senator. The funds are paid over to the authorities who have control of the roads.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is that so?

Mr. SWANSON. They can do what they please with that money.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. SWANSON. The Federal Government has nothing to do with it. It does not watch its expenditure; it does not supervise it. The reason it is fixed that way—and it is wiser—is, first, it prevents the Federal Government from interfering with the State administration; it will relieve the Federal Government from the expense and annoyance of local administration in connection with the roads. Second, the Federal Government does not pay this money until more than double or treble the amount has already been spent to get the roads in good condition and to keep them in that condition for 12 months.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think very likely I did not read the act as intelligently as I should have done. The provision, then, is that the contribution from the General Government shall be paid to the local authorities to augment the funds that are contributed by the municipality, the county, or the State?

Mr. SWANSON. It is paid to the local authorities, because they have for 12 months prior to that time kept their macadam or hard-surface or dirt road in good condition in compliance with the requirements of the law or the requirement fixed by the Federal Government.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am glad I asked the question, because that clarifies the situation. I read it hurriedly. I was afraid we were to have two funds, a national fund and a State or local fund, and I think that would be unfortunate.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator is correct in that statement, and that difficulty and objection were obviated in the drawing of this bill.

Mr. BOURNE. Will the Senator from Virginia permit me for a moment?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BOURNE. The bill provides:

That the compensation herein provided for shall be paid at the end of each fiscal year by the Treasurer of the United States upon warrants drawn upon him by the Postmaster General to the officers entitled to the custody of the funds of the respective highways entitled to compensation under this act under and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General.

Under the terms of the bill I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia to whom he thinks the money will be paid?

Mr. SWANSON. The money would be paid under this bill, which is correct and proper, to the official who, by the law of the State, has charge of the road, who controls it, who improves the road over which the rural carrier goes.

Mr. BOURNE. Under the rules and regulations which may be prepared, but such rules and regulations—

Mr. SWANSON. That fixes the method of payment, the method of receipt, the proper person to receive the money; and the proper person to receive the money is the person who is required to keep the road in the condition required by the Government—the person who has control of it, the person who improves it, the person who ditches it, the person who gets rid of the mudholes, the person who drags it, the person who keeps it reasonably passable during the year.

Mr. BOURNE. Who determines all of that?

Mr. SWANSON. The law determines that. The State law determines the official in the State who has charge of the road, and in this law it is determined that that State official in authority of the road shall receive the money from the Treasury.

Mr. BOURNE. The law prescribes three classifications. The ascertainment as to the classification has to be determined under the provision of the bill. According to the opinion of the department, it would require \$750,000 expenditure on the part of the Government in order first to secure that ascertainment.

Mr. SWANSON. What department made that estimate?

Mr. BOURNE. The Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SWANSON. I wish to say in this connection that the Department of Agriculture is opposed to this proposition and appeared before the committee antagonistic to it. The Department of Agriculture is in favor of the Federal Government's appropriating money to construct roads and to build roads with its own engineers.

Mr. BOURNE and Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I will give way to the chairman of the committee, but after he is through I will try to answer it.

Mr. BOURNE. I simply wanted to say, Mr. President, that I did not want to be put in the attitude in this discussion of being opposed to good roads. I am heartily in favor of good roads. My opinion is, however, that we have not sufficient information upon which to take intelligent action as to the best method of procedure. That was the reason for my support of the committee amendment as a substitute for the House provision.

Now, the Senator from Virginia, as I understand him, made the statement that the bill in the House received almost a unanimous support and vote. I understand there were only 30 or 40 against it.

Mr. SWANSON. No; there were some eighty-odd votes against it.

Mr. BOURNE. Well, it was a very large vote; but, as I understand, this was taken up for consideration by the Committee on Agriculture of the House and under a rule put on the Post Office appropriation bill, and there was no discussion of the bill on the floor of the House. Am I misinformed?

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator is mistaken. There was a very long and full discussion in the House.

Mr. BOURNE. I am correct in the statement, am I not, that it was not discussed in the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House, but in the Committee on Agriculture of the House, and put on the Post Office appropriation bill under a rule.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, by the consent of a large majority of members of the Post Office Committee, who were satisfied with its wisdom and provisions, and the matter was discussed in the House fully and long. After its discussion, some of the most conservative men in the House gave it their support as the best measure that had been proposed. Ex-Speaker CANNON, a very conservative Member I think, gave it his warm and cordial support, I understand, and after the discussion in the House was convinced it was a wise practical measure which would be fraught with much benefit to the country.

If you are going to have Government aid, what does this bill do? Instead of the Government spending four or five hundred million dollars at the time, as some desire, to construct great highways connecting the large cities, for the use of automobiles, this bill says we will first try to stimulate the local communities and see if we can not encourage them and get them to do the work and to improve their roads. To do this we will include all classes of roads. We will give encouragement so as to stimulate the local authorities and see if they will not improve their roads. I believe it will accomplish good results, because by this local stimulation I believe it will give activity and energy and expenditure for road improvement in every section of this country.

Let us see what will happen for the next 12 months. Here is a supervisor of a dirt road. It is in bad condition now. A rural carrier passes over it. The supervisor will know that, commencing the 1st of July, 1913, if he will get his road in good condition, on the 1st of July, 1914, after he has kept it in good condition for 12 months, he will get from the Federal Government \$15 per mile in consideration of that road's having been made and kept in a good condition, fixed by and classified under classification C. That will be a stimulus given to every supervisor of roads in the United States. A man has 10 miles of dirt road to supervise. To-day, if this bill is passed, that man will realize that from the 1st of next July, one year from now, 1913, to the 1st of July, 1914, if he will improve that road, if he will ditch it and drain it and drag it and give it a smooth surface, if he keeps it reasonably passable for 12 months, the Government will contribute \$150 at the end of that time. That will be a stimulus which will give force and vigor to road improvement in every hamlet in the United States. Every road supervisor in the United States will have an ambition or have a desire to get his road improved so that it can be put under class C.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. ROOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia why the States do not stimulate their own officers to keep their roads in repair? Does he mean to confess the incompetence of the States to take care of their own roads?

Mr. SWANSON. I will answer the Senator that a great many of the States do, and where the States have done that there has been good stimulation and good road improvement. The State of Virginia—and I recommended it in my first inaugural address—commenced working its convicts and afterwards appropriating money out of the State treasury for the improvement of public roads. The State of Virginia appropriated from its treasury \$250,000, to be supplemented by an equal amount by the counties. In every county in Virginia the road question became a live question. First the supervisors had to appropriate an amount equal to what the State gave. Consequently it became a live question. Nearly all of the counties responded. After they appropriated enough to be equal to what the State gave, they went further and appropriated five

or six times the amount that the State and the local communities combined did at first. In four years about 400 miles of macadam roads were constructed in Virginia. There is the same condition in New York.

Why was that done? The wealth of this Nation is congregated in the great cities. Take the State of Virginia. Fifty-two per cent of all her taxes are paid by the cities in the State. The country is poor. They can not bear the taxes. The land is poor, and they can not bear the taxes. They can not bear the burden of improving these roads, which are of as much importance to the city as to the country.

When we appropriated \$250,000 out of the Virginia treasury and spent it in the country, 52 per cent of it was paid by the cities, and to that extent the cities were aiding in road construction. The cities were willing to do it. They voted for it unanimously, and many cities would have aided in road construction but for the fact that their charters prohibited it.

The large wealth of this country is in the cities, and when you appropriate money out of the Treasury and expend it for good-road construction in the country, to that extent the cities are aiding in road construction in the country. I think it is all right. I think the cities are as much benefited as is the country by improved country roads. City people use them. City people get commerce and trade and traffic, and that is the most efficient way to distribute the burden of road construction—out of the Federal Treasury, out of the State treasury, and then let the local communities pay their part of it.

The Federal Government uses these roads. The Federal Government has a monopoly of the carrying of the mails. No private citizen can engage in that business. It is prohibited by law. The Federal Government has its vast mail system going to all parts of this country. Its mail system goes over the railroads, with its private stockholders. Then it is distributed over 2,000,000 miles of road which have been constructed and over which it has been made possible to carry the mail by the expenditure of money by the people of the country. The railroads receive in payment for carrying the mail over railroads \$51,000,000 a year, and when it comes to distributing this same mail over the country roads not a cent, not a dollar, is paid. I say, if the Federal Government pays for its mails, it ought to pay for the transportation of its mails everywhere, because the Federal Government ought to be a model citizen and get nothing without paying for it. It ought to teach a lesson.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. The Senator from Virginia is speaking of roads which are public highways, open to the travel of all classes. He proposes that over those roads everyone shall pass free except the carrier who brings the mail.

Mr. SWANSON. No—

Mr. ROOT. If the State of Virginia chooses to set up toll-gates and charge tolls for passage over its roads, I agree that the carrier of the Federal Government should pay tolls just as any other man who drives a horse and wagon over the road. But that the Government of the United States alone shall pay for the privilege of using a road to carry the mails to the people of Virginia, I say is a mere flimsy subterfuge to get money out of the Treasury of the Government.

Mr. SWANSON. Here is the position of the Senator from New York. The State of Virginia does make every citizen of the State who uses her public roads pay—pay in taxes, which are collected and enforced. There is no way to make the Federal Government pay. And all that this proposition is is that the Federal Government shall be generous enough, be a model citizen, and pay for a thing when it uses it and gets the benefit. There is no way by which the State government can tax the Federal Government and make it pay. It is supreme; it is powerful. What I believe is that the Federal Government not only ought to pay a fair price for that privilege and be a model citizen, but I believe it has a sufficient interest in the development of the trade, in the development of the commerce, in the development of the wealth of this Nation, to make it aid in this direction also.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield further to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. ROOT. If the proposition were that the Federal Government should pay into the treasury of the State of Virginia an amount of money equivalent to the amount of taxes on the property of the Federal Government in the State of Virginia, proportionate to the amount of taxes that would go to the keeping up of the roads, I would meet the Senator, but to put the Federal Government alone in the position of having to pay for using a public highway which is free to all the rest of the

world, I say is nothing but a subterfuge, a plain, flimsy subterfuge, to get money out of the Federal Treasury and tax the people of this country thousands of miles away to keep up roads in the State of Virginia and other States who want to get this subvention.

I warn the Senator that he can not maintain the sovereignty and the authority of his State if he is going step by step to bring the Federal Government into the payment of the expenses of carrying on of the government of his State.

Mr. SWANSON. In reply to the Senator from New York I will say that I think the Federal Government should pay for any use it makes of property or roads, if it is able to do it. It is an immense expense to the people living along the line of roads. They are taxed and burdened to keep them in condition. I see no reason why the Federal Government should not be a model citizen, and like all other taxpayers, help to keep the roads in condition when it uses them.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me on that doctrine the United States ought to contribute in every city to the maintenance of pavements, both on the sidewalks and in the middle of the streets over which the carriers walk and the mail wagons pass.

Mr. SWANSON. The cities have municipal rights, special charters and special privileges given them by the States, and I am not here arguing the question of the cities. I am here simply saying that the United States Government has an interest in good roads—has as much interest as anybody—and it is as much benefited as anybody, and should contribute to help to keep those roads in good condition, especially when it uses those roads.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. BOURNE. The Government receives no benefit from the use of these roads except the benefit for the general welfare of the community that it serves. I understand the Government is expected to pay a rental for the use of the roads, determined by the classification provided in the bill, of \$25 or \$20 or \$15 per mile. If Congress enacts such legislation as that, why could not a municipality as properly call upon Congress to pay a rental for the use of the sidewalks and the streets for the carriers of letters in the municipality?

Mr. SWANSON. If the Federal Government was satisfied that it would be sufficiently benefited, that it would get a sufficient return, the Federal Government would be justified in making any expenditures where the return is equal and exceeds the expenditure made for its own property and its use.

Now, take this case. Here are 42,000 carriers going about 1,000,000 miles daily over the public roads. A carrier can go 20 miles on a bad road, or possibly 19. He can go on a good road 30 or 40 miles. The Government would save 25 per cent on any rural delivery route if it has a good road over the rural delivery route which was improved and benefited and made passable. It would seem to me that the Federal Government by the use of these roads is interested in their improvement, and that it ought to pay something to improve them and put them in a condition for proper use.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator seems to be proceeding upon the theory that the Federal Government is enjoying a special favor from the community by being permitted to use a road in order to deliver the mails to the citizens living on that road. If the privilege of using the road for this rural mail delivery is a favor to the Government, suppose the Government can not see that in itself as a general proposition it gets any advantage from the rural road? It is expensive. It costs for a carrier, we will say, \$1,100 a year, and if then it costs \$500 a year additional for keeping up the road, it might conclude that it was a service that was too expensive. What would the Senator say to that?

Mr. SWANSON. I would say to that that the Government has a monopoly of carrying the mails. It has taken that benefit and burden combined on its shoulders. Nobody can engage in the business of carrying the mail. It is done by the Federal Government because it can be done by it better and more economically than anybody else can do it. It has assumed the obligation to give mail facilities quickly, promptly, and immediately to all its citizens. It is one of the special functions of

the Government. Having decided to do that, it is its duty to carry the mail to all its citizens. Now, when it carries the mail over a rural delivery route it benefits itself by giving intelligence, by giving wealth, by increasing the population in rural sections. The Government is benefited as much as the citizen is benefited. Then the Federal Government is benefited when it uses the road as its post road, and I do not see any reason why the Federal Government should not pay a part of the amount necessary to keep these roads in use to benefit them, because the Federal Government is improved and benefited by having good roads for the star route, rural delivery, and all the service, in addition to the general benefit that accrues from the development of commerce, the development of the country, and the promotion of the general welfare of the Nation.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Federal Government is maintaining a rural delivery service at a very great expense. It costs from five to six times as much as the service yields in revenue to deliver the mails to the rural communities. And now the Senator from Virginia proposes, in addition to imposing this great tax on the American people to deliver the mails to the rural communities, to tax them and make them keep up the roads in the rural communities, because it is extending this great privilege to the people who live in those communities. To my mind it is the most amazing proposition ever presented to an intelligent body of men for their consideration.

Mr. SWANSON. In regard to the Rural Delivery Service the Senator is mistaken in the attack he has made on the Rural Delivery Service.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. To-day it costs about \$42,000,000. It is estimated that it saves in star routes abolished and post offices abolished about \$26,000,000—

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON (continuing). Making it cost about \$16,000,000. There are 42,000 rural-delivery routes. If there are gathered on each route \$400 in postage, the extension of the Rural Delivery Service has not been expensive, nor has it cost anything to the Government if the average postage on each route equals about \$400.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia further yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator greatly overestimates the amount of revenue that is collected from the rural routes. There is nothing like \$26,000,000 collected from the rural routes.

Mr. SWANSON. I did not make that statement. I said the extension of the Rural Delivery Service by the abolition of the star route service and by the abolition of post offices, it has been estimated, and I have seen the estimate made, has saved about \$26,000,000 in that respect, which makes the service cost about \$16,000,000 without crediting it with any postage. I said that there are 42,000 of these routes. I do not know how much mail goes over each route, but if there is \$400 received in postage it does seem to me that it is not costing the Government anything.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia further yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator is proceeding upon the assumption that \$26,000,000 is being collected. The premises upon which the Senator is proceeding are altogether wrong. There is no such amount saved or collected. Now, the Senator speaks of abolishing post offices.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator makes this mistake. I said that the star routes and post offices abolished have saved \$26,000,000.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator speaks of the saving of money by abolishing post offices. There have been a number of small post offices abolished where the receipts were very little, but the stamps which were formerly canceled or sold at those post offices are canceled or sold at other post offices, and other postmasters are getting the revenues that formerly went to those postmasters. The Senator knows that in his own State he has had a great deal of trouble at times where a post office was taken away, because the postmaster did not want to lose the revenues of that place and have it transferred to another office. When post offices are abolished there is not any economy in it that amounts to anything, and there is no economy in abolishing star routes of any consequence.

The Senator assumes that I was attacking the Rural Delivery Service. I am not. I am in favor of the Rural Delivery Service, and I think I have done something in my time to promote it.

I think it is a generous contribution the Government of the United States is making for the convenience and benefit of its citizens. But when they claim that because the Government does extend this service at a heavy expense for their benefit it also ought to keep up their roads in order that the mail might be delivered, I say again it is preposterous and almost unthinkable, and I do not believe any considerable number of citizens would demand such a thing. If we are going to make a Federal contribution to the creation of a good-road system in the United States, let us make it openly and squarely and fairly for that purpose and not, as the Senator from New York says, hide behind such a flimsy subterfuge as is contained in the bill.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I wish to say, in justice to the Senator from Kansas, that when I used the word "attack" I possibly used a stronger expression than I intended. I know he has been a good friend of rural delivery. I know when he was Assistant Postmaster General he took a great deal of pleasure in extending the service and doing all he could to make the service efficient.

Now, as to a flimsy excuse, I stated the reason why this money should be appropriated. First, it is because I believe the Federal Government should aid roads. Second, it is because I believe the Federal Government should pay for the use of roads. Both these I consider are sufficient reasons for passing this appropriation. It amounts to a very small sum of money when you consider the benefits that will accrue to the Nation.

The Federal aid of \$18,000,000 a year by this provision would do what? It would stimulate road improvement. It would enable and induce the local communities from one end of the country to the other for 12 months to try to improve their roads of all kinds and put them in better condition. It would give a stimulus and create rivalry. They would try to get their roads up to the requirements. I believe the Federal Government would be benefited by the use of these roads. How? Because the 42,000 rural-delivery carriers could travel much farther and could do more work. It would be a saving of five or six million dollars a year in the improved use of roads and in the greater amount of work that the rural carriers could do. I say that the Federal Government, as the user of these roads, can well afford to pay that money to get the increased benefit as a user of the roads.

Then, as to the argument of the enforcement of State sovereignty, there is a disposition always when anything comes to benefit the country, to benefit the farmer, to benefit the masses of the people, to appeal to State sovereignty to defeat it. But when it comes to other purposes, when it comes to other demands and other uses, State sovereignty is not invoked. The rural communities get very little from the Federal Government. Nearly all the public buildings are erected in cities. The amounts expended for river and harbor appropriations are expenditures that do not reach the great masses of the people. It is the average country road that touches the great mass of the people. The Federal Government has given millions and millions of dollars to aid railroad construction, in order to give cheap transportation and develop commerce, and millions of dollars for river improvements to get cheap transportation on the rivers, and I am at a loss to understand why it should refuse to give good sums of money to stimulate road construction in the rural sections.

Now, there is another feature of this bill that I think is beneficial. It does not refuse to benefit the people who have already benefited themselves. Most bills introduced gave nothing to the people who had already built roads. This does. It pays for the use of macadam roads; it gives to hard-surface roads or burnt-clay roads. This bill carries its benefits to all sections of the country and treats them fairly and justly.

If the Federal Government is going into national aid to roads, I believe it is worth while to try this experiment. I believe it will be beneficial; I believe it will produce a road development, a road stimulus reaching the sections of the country where it will produce good results; I believe if we pass this law and come back here in 1914 the road improvement, the development, the benefits that would accrue would be amazing, because you would have every supervisor of every road in the United States active, energetic, and earnest in trying to get the money that would be paid to him for keeping his road in good condition.

Mr. BOURNE. Will the Senator permit me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. BOURNE. I wish to ask the Senator upon what method of ascertainment was the \$25 rental, the \$20 rental, and the \$15 rental determined? Was it upon the interest or the capital or the charge for deterioration because of the use each day by the rural carrier, or how?

Mr. SWANSON. It was determined in this way, I presume: It was figured about \$20,000,000 as the amount the Government

could afford to give at this time to road improvement. This bill would amount nearly to \$20,000,000 a year if all the roads were brought up to the class required under the provisions.

Now, then, to make it absolutely constitutional, so there could be no question about it, which was necessary to get rid of the objections of some gentlemen, it was limited to star routes and rural-delivery routes, the Constitution giving express powers to the Federal Government in connection with those. This was thought to be the best way to give general aid, fair aid, efficient aid, and at the same time let the Government pay something for the use of the roads. But I can see no reason why the Federal Government can not expend money on roads it uses and put them in a better condition, so it will save the Government large sums of money and at the same time give a stimulus to State, county, and local communities to get all their roads in good condition and keep them in good condition.

Mr. REED and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri. I have some tables, and so forth, that I wish to put in my remarks. I ask the privilege of putting them in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator has permission.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Statement showing the number and mileage of rural and star routes, furnished by the Hon. P. V. De Grave, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

1. On April 1, 1912, the total number of star routes in operation was 12,656, the number of miles traveled daily on these routes being 318,280.

2. The star routes, classified as to frequency of service, are as follows:

Times served per week.	Number of routes.	Times served per week.	Number of routes.
1.....	196	18.....	102
2.....	875	19.....	36
3.....	2,346	20.....	9
4.....	11	21.....	8
5.....	1	24.....	38
6.....	7,368	25.....	9
7.....	371	26.....	4
8.....	2	27.....	3
11.....	1	28.....	5
12.....	1,118	30.....	4
13.....	94	32.....	1
14.....	53	33.....	1

3. The total number of rural routes in operation is 42,100, of which 681 are served triweekly.

4. On April 1, 1912, the total number of rural and star routes in operation in each State was as follows:

States.	Rural.	Star.	States.	Rural.	Star.
Alabama.....	1,017	295	Nevada.....	3	81
Arizona.....	11	83	New Hampshire.....	237	132
Arkansas.....	417	598	New Jersey.....	303	119
California.....	378	424	New Mexico.....	15	229
Colorado.....	150	257	New York.....	1,899	550
Connecticut.....	279	57	North Carolina.....	1,306	432
Delaware.....	107	14	North Dakota.....	531	222
District of Columbia.....	7	Ohio.....	2,539	183
Florida.....	202	233	Oklahoma.....	1,026	337
Georgia.....	1,639	109	Oregon.....	230	245
Hawaii.....	26	Pennsylvania.....	2,203	639
Idaho.....	112	167	Porto Rico.....	33
Illinois.....	2,856	90	Rhode Island.....	43	19
Indiana.....	2,120	90	South Carolina.....	774	135
Iowa.....	2,424	55	South Dakota.....	559	203
Kansas.....	1,802	148	Tennessee.....	1,605	244
Kentucky.....	733	943	Texas.....	1,912	679
Louisiana.....	181	333	Utah.....	51	124
Maine.....	408	297	Vermont.....	340	144
Maryland.....	437	156	Virginia.....	1,013	699
Massachusetts.....	209	144	Washington.....	301	198
Michigan.....	2,027	173	West Virginia.....	369	514
Minnesota.....	1,594	195	Wisconsin.....	1,642	170
Mississippi.....	779	307	Wyoming.....	10	154
Missouri.....	2,067	468			
Montana.....	45	209			
Nebraska.....	1,047	231			
			Total.....	42,100	12,656

5. The aggregate mileage traveled by rural and star route carriers is as follows:

Rural delivery:	
Daily travel.....	1,010,396
Annual travel.....	310,191,572
Star route:	
Daily travel.....	318,280
Annual travel.....	84,678,423

6. The total length of routes is:

Rural delivery.....	1,018,908
Star delivery.....	160,058

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator from Virginia if he has concluded?

* Total length of star routes is based upon travel one way only.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator from Virginia if he has concluded?

Mr. SWANSON. At present I am going to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to ask—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. REED. For what purpose?

Mr. WARREN. I wish to ask whoever has the floor if it would be convenient to yield to a conference report, a privileged question, at the present time?

Mr. REED. I have no objection.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] before I yield the floor, as I thought he desired to ask a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I rose to be recognized by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has the floor; he has yielded to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]; and the Senator from Missouri yields to the Senator from Wyoming for a privileged question.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order. The Senator occupying the floor can, of course, yield to another Senator for an interruption, but he can not abandon the floor and yield it to any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point is well taken.

Mr. SWANSON. I yielded to the Senator from Missouri, expecting him to ask me a question, and he told me that he intended to make a speech.

Mr. LODGE. That is all right. Then the Senator from Virginia still retains the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia yielded the floor to the Senator from Missouri, and the Senator from Missouri yielded to the Senator from Wyoming for the purpose of making a privileged report.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WARREN submitted the following report (S. Doc. No. 891):

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 24023) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 83, 86, 91, 92, 98, 104, 105, 106, 110, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 129, 142, 143, 154, 155, 161, 162, 166, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 187, 192, 244, 250, 251, 252, 254, 255, 256, 257, 260, 261, 262, 263, 269, 271, 272, 279, 280, 288, 289, 291, 293, 294, 296, 297, 298, 300, 303, 304, 305, 307, 308, 312, 316, 317, 318, 319, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 328, 329, 333, 334, 335, 336, 341, 342, 343, 346, 347, 352, 353, 354, 355, 360, 361, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 374, 375, 376, 377, 379, 383, 384, 385, 388, 389, 410, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 423, 424, 426, 428, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 441, 442, 450, 454, 456, 457, 458, 460, 461, 462, 464, 467, 468, 469, 471, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 484, 485, 486, 487, 490, 491, 494, 496, 497, 498, 499, 505, 506, 507, 510, and 515.

That the House recede from its disagreements to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 80, 82, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 107, 108, 111, 113, 114, 118, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 152, 153, 160, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 183, 185, 188, 189, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 253, 259, 265, 266, 267, 268, 273, 274, 276, 277, 278, 281, 282, 287, 290, 295, 299, 311, 313, 315, 320, 327, 330, 331, 332, 337, 338, 339, 340, 344, 345, 348, 350, 351, 356, 357, 358, 359, 362, 364, 365, 372, 378, 380, 381, 382, 386, 387, 390, 391, 396, 397, 398, 400, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 411, 419, 420, 427, 429, 440, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 451, 452, 453, 455, 459, 465, 466, 470, 472, 480, 481, 482, 483, 488, 489, 492, 493, 495, 500, 502, and 503, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For fuel and advertising, exclusive of labor, \$2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said amendment strike out the following: "to be immediately available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$72,056.66"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "2 charwomen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$229,830"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 123: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "director of the consular service, \$4,500; counselor for the Department of State, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, \$7,500; 8 officers to aid in important drafting work, 4 at \$4,500 each and 4 at \$3,000 each, to be appointed by the Secretary of State, any of whom may be employed as chief of division of far eastern, Latin American, near eastern, or European affairs, or upon other work in connection with foreign relations; assistant solicitor, \$3,000; law clerk, \$2,500; clerks—2 of class 3; 2 of class 1; 2 at \$1,000 each; 3 assistant messengers"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 124: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$317,560"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 132: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$60,670"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 151: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 151, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "Hereafter the administrative examination of all public accounts, preliminary to their audit by the accounting officers of the Treasury, shall be made as contemplated by the so-called Dockery Act, approved July 31, 1894, and all vouchers and pay rolls shall be prepared and examined by and through the administrative heads of divisions and bureaus in the executive departments and not by the disbursing clerks of said departments, except those vouchers heretofore prepared outside of Washington may continue to be so prepared, and the disbursing officers shall make only such examination of vouchers as may be necessary to ascertain whether they represent legal claims against the United States;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$310,070;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "twenty-five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 158: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "eleven;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$148,650;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 169: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$336,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 52 of the bill, in line 11, strike out the following: "news-papers,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 184: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 186: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For purchase, exchange, maintenance, and repair of motor trucks, and maintenance of horses and carriages, to be used for official purposes only, including not exceeding \$6,000 for the purchase of two motor trucks and one motor delivery wagon, \$8,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 190: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 190, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "On and after October 1, 1912, the whole number of collection districts for the collection of internal revenue and the whole number of collectors of internal revenue shall not exceed 63"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "paying teller, \$2,000; receiving teller, \$1,900; exchange teller, \$1,800; vault clerk, \$1,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 195: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 195, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$34,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 226: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 226, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "1 at \$2,300, 1 at \$2,100, 2 at \$2,000 each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 243: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 243, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$190,610"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 253: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 253, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 264: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 264, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "During the fiscal year 1913 no vacancy occurring in the classified service of the War Department herein provided for shall be filled except by promotion or demotion from among those within said service, until the whole number of those herein authorized in said classified service of the department shall have been reduced not less than 5 per cent. And the salaries or compensation of all places herein provided for that may be embraced within such reduction shall not be available for expenditure but shall lapse and be covered into the Treasury"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 270: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 270, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$149,820"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 275: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 275,

and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$26,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 283: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 283, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "thirteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 284: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 284, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "sixteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 285: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 285, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "ten"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 286: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 286, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$103,820"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 292: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 292, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$91,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 301: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 301, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$112,440"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 302: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 302, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "two"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 306: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 306, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 309: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 309, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "nine"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 310: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 310, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$78,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 314: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 314, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$102,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 349: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 349, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$275,570"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 363: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 363, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$630,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 371: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 371, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter inserted by said amendment, and on page 100 of the bill, in line 1, after the word "watchmen," insert the following: "for the following under the chief clerk of the Interior Department: Engineer, \$1,200, and 2 firemen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 373: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 373, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,478,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 392: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 392, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu

of the sum proposed insert "\$16,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 393: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 393, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$19,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 394: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 394, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$8,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 395: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 395, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$11,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 399: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 399, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$4,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 401: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 401, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$14,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 402: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 402, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$17,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 403: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 403, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$17,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 404: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 404, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 421: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 421, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "fourteen"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 422: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 422, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "twenty-one"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 425: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 425, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$424,610"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 463: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 463, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$104,860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 478: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 478, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "physicist, qualified in optics, \$3,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 479: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 479, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$239,940"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 501: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 501, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: " : *Provided*, That no part of any money appropriated in lump sum in this act shall be available for the payment of personal services at a rate of compensation in excess of that paid for the same or similar services during the fiscal year 1912; nor shall any person employed at a specific salary under this act be transferred during the fiscal year 1913 and be paid from a lump-

sum appropriation a rate of compensation greater than such specific salary"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 504: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 504, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In lines 7 and 9 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "maximum" where it occurs, and add after the matter inserted by said amendment, as a separate section, the following:

"SEC. 5. That on and after September 1, 1913, all appointments to positions in the classified service of the executive departments within the District of Columbia provided for at annual rates of compensation shall be made, after the probationary period shall have expired, for terms of seven years each; at the expiration of each such appointment the employment of each person so appointed shall cease and determine; and the employment of all persons in the classified service of the executive departments within the District of Columbia, at annual rates of compensation, who were appointed prior to September 1, 1912, shall cease and determine, unless previously separated from the service, within one year after the 31st day of August, 1919, the particular date of such termination within said year to be determined by the head of the department concerned, and on the basis of the length of service, within the classified service, of each such person prior to September 1, 1912: *Provided*, That all persons separated hereunder from the classified service shall be eligible for, and may, in the discretion of the head of the executive department, be reappointed without examination for additional periods of seven years if at the time of such reappointment they shall be up to the standard of efficiency then in force and as hereinbefore set forth, and capable of rendering a full measure of service in return for the salary of the place to which they may be appointed: *Provided further*, That in reducing the force in any of the executive departments no honorably discharged soldier or sailor whose record in said department is rated good shall be discharged or dropped: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the head of any department from removing at any time, in accordance with civil-service rules, for good and sufficient cause, any employee of his department."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 508: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 508, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, before the word "telephone," insert the words "long distance"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 509: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 509, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended as follows: On page 144 of the bill, in line 17, after the word "publication," insert the words "for public distribution." On page 145 of the bill, in line 9, after the word "the," insert the word "public." And on page 146 of the bill, after the word "appropriations" in line 5, insert the following: " : *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as applying to orders, instructions, directions, notices, or circulars of information, printed for and issued by any of the executive departments or other Government establishments or to the distribution of public documents by Senators or Members of the House of Representatives or to the folding rooms and documents rooms of the Senate or House of Representatives"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 511, 512, 513, and 514: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 511, 512, 513, and 514, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the entire text of the amended section insert the following:

"That the Commerce Court created and established by the act entitled 'An act to create a Commerce Court and to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended, and for other purposes,' approved June 18, 1910, be, and the same hereby is, abolished and the jurisdiction vested in said Commerce Court by said act is hereby transferred to and vested in the several district courts of the United States.

"All cases pending and undisposed of in said Commerce Court are hereby transferred to and shall be deemed pending in the district court of the judicial district in which the cause of action in the first instance arose, and the venue of all suits and proceedings hereafter brought by or against the Interstate Commerce Commission to enforce, set aside or modify the decrees and orders of the commission shall be in the district

court of the judicial district in which the cause of action in the first instance arose.

"The venue in suits brought to enforce an order for the payment of money shall be in the district court of the judicial district in which the complainant resides. The procedure in the district court in respect to cases of which jurisdiction is conferred upon them by this act shall be the same as that heretofore prevailing in the said Commerce Court, and the right of appeal from the district courts in such cases shall be the same as the right of appeal heretofore prevailing under existing law from the Commerce Court. No interlocutory injunction suspending or restraining the enforcement, operation, or execution of any order made or entered by the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be issued or granted by any justice of the Supreme Court, or by any district court of the United States, or by any judge thereof, or by any circuit judge acting as district judge, unless the application for the same shall be presented to a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, or to a circuit or district judge, and shall be heard and determined by three judges, of whom at least one shall be a justice of the Supreme Court, or a circuit judge, and the other two may be either circuit or district judges, and unless a majority of said three judges shall concur in granting such application. When such application as aforesaid is presented to a justice of the Supreme Court, or to a judge, he shall immediately call to his assistance to hear and determine the application two other judges: *Provided, however*, That one of such three judges shall be a justice of the Supreme Court, or a circuit judge. Said application shall not be heard or determined before at least five days' notice of the hearing has been given to the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the Attorney General of the United States, and to such other persons as may be defendants in the suit: *Provided*, That if of opinion that irreparable loss or damage would result to the complainant unless a temporary restraining order is granted, any justice of the Supreme Court, or any circuit or district judge, may grant such temporary restraining order at any time before such hearing and determination of the application for an interlocutory injunction, but such temporary restraining order shall remain in force only until the hearing and determination of the application for an interlocutory injunction upon notice as aforesaid. The hearing upon such application for an interlocutory injunction shall be given precedence, and shall be in every way expedited and be assigned for a hearing at the earliest practicable day after the expiration of the notice hereinbefore provided for. An appeal may be taken direct to the Supreme Court of the United States from the order granting or denying, after notice and hearing, an interlocutory injunction in such case; and upon the final hearing of any suit brought to annul, enjoin, or restrain any order of said commission the same requirement as to judges and the same procedure as to appeal shall apply. The provisions of this section shall also apply to the issuing and granting of interlocutory injunctions suspending or restraining the enforcement, operation, or execution of orders made by any administrative board or commission created by and acting under the statute of a State. That in such case the notice required shall be served upon the defendants in the case, and upon the attorney general of the State. All cases pending in the Commerce Court at the date of the passage of this act shall be transferred forthwith to said district courts. Each of said cases and all the records, papers, and proceedings shall be transferred to the district court wherein it might have been filed at the time it was filed in the Commerce Court if this act had then been in effect, and if it might have been filed in any one of two or more district courts it shall be transferred to that one of said district courts which may be designated by the petitioner or petitioners in said case, or, upon failure of said petitioners to act in the premises within 10 days after the passage of this act, to such one of said district courts as may be designated by the judges of the Commerce Court. The judges of the Commerce Court shall have authority, and are hereby directed, to make any and all orders and to take any other action necessary to transfer as aforesaid the cases and all the records, papers, and proceedings then pending in the Commerce Court to said district courts."

And the Senate agree to the same.

F. E. WARREN,
GEO. PEABODY WETMORE,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. T. JOHNSON,
A. S. BURLISON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WARREN. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD the statement which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission to do so will be granted.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Total additions by Senate	\$740,740.44
Reductions by Senate	47,440.00
Net amount added by Senate	693,300.44
Senate recessions	336,003.34
House agreements	357,297.10
Restored to House bill items stricken out by the Senate	47,440.00
	404,737.10
Amount of bill as passed House	33,782,854.06
Amount of bill as agreed upon	34,187,591.16
Amount of law for 1912	36,157,209.85
Amount of the estimates for 1913	35,684,267.40
The bill as agreed upon is less than the law for 1912	1,969,618.69
The bill as agreed upon is less than the estimates	1,496,676.24

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. REED and Mr. CUMMINS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I merely wished to say that I do not want this conference report to be adopted without our knowing anything about it. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I rose to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to tell the Senate, otherwise than by numbers, what has been done with regard to the chief disagreements between the two Houses in this bill. I am in no position to vote upon the conference report until I know more definitely than I now do just what the conferees on the part of the Senate have agreed to relinquish.

Mr. WARREN. What has the Senator from Iowa especially in mind?

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, I have especially in mind the provisions affecting the Commerce Court and the abolition of the civil-service system. Those are the two I have principally in mind.

Mr. WARREN. As to the Commerce Court, that, of course, has been done away with as a court. The Senate conferees receded from the Senate amendment declaring five places vacant, and agreed to the House provision that there should be no more circuit judges appointed until the number is reduced to 29. On the other hand, the House conferees receded from their disagreement to the Senate amendment providing other modes of transacting the business heretofore transacted by the Commerce Court, with an amendment, which I think the Senator understands, which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], and others helped the Committee on Appropriations to construct.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. REED. It was absolutely impossible for us on this side of the Chamber to understand what the Senator has said. There is some confusion in the Chamber, and he had his face turned in the opposite direction.

Mr. WARREN. I beg the Senator's pardon. In answer to the inquiry about the Commerce Court, I said that the Senate receded from its proposition to abolish five circuit judges. The Senate amendment providing for a transfer of the business of the Commerce Court to the district courts was agreed to with an amendment perfecting it.

Mr. REED. In other words, as this bill is now reported the Commerce Court is retained.

Mr. WARREN. No; there is no Commerce Court; that was done away with by the action of both the other House and the Senate before the bill was sent to conference. The only difference is that there are now 34 circuit judges, and there will be no new ones appointed until the number is reduced to 29, if this bill as now reported becomes a law.

Mr. REED. In other words, the five judges of the Commerce Court keep their offices as judges and continue to draw their salaries?

Mr. WARREN. As circuit judges.

Mr. REED. And then no more circuit judges are to be appointed until the number is reduced to 29?

Mr. WARREN. Not until the number is reduced to 29.

Mr. REED. The Senate succeeded in saving the salary of the judges?

Mr. WARREN. No; on the contrary, the Senate was obliged to recede from its proposition to discharge five judges on the demand of the House conferees. There are no appropriations

for the Commerce Court; and there will be no Commerce Court under the bill.

As to the civil-service provision, the House receded from its objection to the Senate amendment, which provided for efficiency ratings. The Senate receded from its objection to the House amendment, which made the term of employment five years, after inserting in it language making the shortest term seven years commencing next September, and providing that those who enter the civil service thereafter will be appointed for terms of seven years, unless sooner separated from the service, with, of course, provision for their reemployment if their standard of efficiency is sufficient. As to those now in the service, they are required during the period of one year after seven years from the 1st of September next to all pass over the line of reappointment or rejection if they are not up to the requirements which the Civil Service Commission may establish.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the effect of the agreement upon the part of the managers of the conference is, I take it, therefore, that the five judges who now constitute the Commerce Court are continued as circuit judges, to be assigned in various parts of the country as the occasion may require. I do not care to discuss that phase of it. I do not believe in constituting our circuit court in that way; but everything has been said—at least on my part—that will be said concerning that subject. I should like, however, to have read just what the managers have agreed to with respect to the procedure in the district courts which now have or will have jurisdiction of the cases heretofore given to the Commerce Court.

Mr. WARREN. I will ask the Secretary to read that portion of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the request of the Senator from Iowa, the Secretary will read the provision in the conference report to which the Senator refers.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the text of the amended section it is proposed to insert the following:

That the Commerce Court, created and established by the act entitled "An act to create a Commerce Court and to amend the act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1910, be, and the same hereby is, abolished and the jurisdiction vested in said Commerce Court by said act is hereby transferred to and vested in the several district courts of the United States.

All cases pending and undisposed of in said Commerce Court are hereby transferred to and shall be deemed pending in the district court of the judicial district in which the cause of action in the first instance arose, and the venue of all suits and proceedings hereafter brought by or against the Interstate Commerce Commission to enforce, set aside, or modify the decrees and orders of the commission shall be in the district court of the judicial district in which the cause of action in the first instance arose.

The venue in suits brought to enforce an order for the payment of money shall be in the district court of the judicial district in which the complainant resides. The procedure in the district court in respect to cases of which jurisdiction is conferred upon them by this act shall be the same as that heretofore prevailing in the said Commerce Court, and the right of appeal from the district courts in such cases shall be the same as the right of appeal heretofore prevailing under existing law from the Commerce Court. No interlocutory injunction suspending or restraining the enforcement, operation, or execution of any order made or entered by the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be issued or granted by any justice of the Supreme Court, or by any district court of the United States, or by any judge thereof, or by any circuit judge acting as district judge, unless the application for the same shall be presented to a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, or to a circuit or district judge, and shall be heard and determined by three judges, of whom at least one shall be a justice of the Supreme Court, or a circuit court judge, and the other two may be either circuit or district judges, and unless a majority of said three judges shall concur in granting such application. When such application as aforesaid is presented to a justice of the Supreme Court, or to a judge, he shall immediately call to his assistance to hear and determine the application two other judges: *Provided, however*, That one of such three judges shall be a justice of the Supreme Court, or a circuit judge. Said application shall not be heard or determined before at least five days' notice of the hearing has been given to the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the Attorney General of the United States, and to such other persons as may be defendants in the suit: *Provided*, That if of opinion that irreparable loss or damage would result to the complainant unless a temporary restraining order is granted, any justice of the Supreme Court, or any circuit or district judge, may grant such temporary restraining order at any time before such hearing and determination of the application for an interlocutory injunction, but such temporary restraining order shall remain in force only until the hearing and determination of the application for an interlocutory injunction upon notice as aforesaid. The hearing upon such application for an interlocutory injunction shall be given precedence, and shall be in every way expedited and be assigned for a hearing at the earliest practicable day after the expiration of the notice hereinbefore provided for. An appeal may be taken direct to the Supreme Court of the United States from the order granting or denying, after notice and hearing, an interlocutory injunction in such case; and upon the final hearing of any suit brought to annul, enjoin, or restrain any order of said commission the same requirement as to judges and the same procedure as to appeal shall apply. The provisions of this section shall also apply to the issuing and granting of interlocutory injunctions suspending or restraining the enforcement, operation, or execution of orders made by any administrative board or commission created by and acting under the statute of a State. That in such case the notice required shall be served upon the defendants in the case, and upon the attorney general of the State. All cases pending in the Commerce Court at the date of the passage of this act shall be transferred forthwith to said

district courts. Each of said cases and all the records, papers, and proceedings shall be transferred to the district court wherein it might have been filed at the time it was filed in the Commerce Court if this act had then been in effect, and if it might have been filed in any one of two or more district courts it shall be transferred to that one of said district courts which may be designated by the petitioner or petitioners in said case, or, upon failure of said petitioners to act in the premises within 10 days after the passage of this act, to such one of said district courts as may be designated by the judges of the Commerce Court. The judges of the Commerce Court shall have authority, and are hereby directed, to make any and all orders and to take any other action necessary to transfer as aforesaid the cases and all the records, papers, and proceedings then pending in the Commerce Court to said district courts.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have the Secretary reread that portion of the proposed amendment which refers to the laws of a State. I did not catch that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

The provisions of this section shall also apply to the issuing and granting of interlocutory injunctions suspending or restraining the enforcement, operation, or execution of orders made by any administrative board or commission created by and acting under the statute of a State. That in such case the notice required shall be served upon the defendants in the case, and upon the attorney general of the State.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is sufficient. I think it is a bad provision; but I think it is substantially as we agreed to it in the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, there are two points with regard to the substitution of the conference committee which I think deserve a little further inquiry and investigation. They are these: First, the law which we passed in 1910 provides that all suits brought to set aside on appeal an order by the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be brought against the United States *ex nomine*. A later provision in the law gives the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to intervene.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. JONES. It seems to me that this matter is likely to create considerable discussion, and that the conference report ought to be printed so that we may study it and ascertain what it means.

Mr. CUMMINS. I was about to point out one or two objections in order to justify a request that the report shall be printed so that we may examine it, and I will now make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa asks that the report go over and be printed. Is there objection?

Mr. WARREN obtained the floor.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me to make a suggestion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I notice in the reading of this amendment that it refers in one or two places to the "circuit court judge." Of course, there is not any such officer as a circuit court judge, because there is not a circuit court. It should be "a circuit judge." It is evidently a mere clerical error, and I suggest to the chairman of the committee that perhaps that could be corrected without sending the report back. It ought not to go into the law in that form, at any rate.

Mr. WARREN. What is the Senator's suggestion?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. To strike out the word "court." The title of the judge is "circuit judge," not "circuit court judge."

Mr. GALLINGER. That will take it back to conference.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator desire to send the report back to conference?

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Wyoming is not to be blamed for that error. I am sure it was in the amendment which I offered. I took that language from the law which was in force at the time when there were circuit court judges and it has been allowed to pass through without notice, apparently. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is right, of course. However, is there any reason why the report should not be printed?

Mr. WARREN. I am glad the Senator places the blame where it belongs and not with the managers of the conference. I think the Senator will remember that when we came to this part of the bill on its passage through the Senate I asked the learned lawyers of this body to provide the necessary machinery for the transfer to other courts of the business heretofore done by the Commerce Court, and when the matter was so furnished here and voted in, I assumed that it was correct, but upon investigation, finding that there were differences, the matter was referred to the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Minnesota and also leading gentlemen representing the House.

This proposition of change now comes entirely as a new matter. Possibly I had better withdraw the report and submit it to the House conferees and change it. You can not call it a clerical error, because it is not the error of a clerk.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is a clerical error in a sense. I suppose I directed the clerk to copy the existing law upon that subject, with reference to another matter, and the words "circuit court judge" were in that law.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think the Senator from Iowa is taking upon himself some blame that does not belong to him.

Mr. CUMMINS. I want to relieve the conferees.

Mr. WARREN. Put it all on the conferees.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think that the suggestion that I made at first is exactly correct. It is a clerical error. As it appears in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa the correct term is used, and the term "circuit judge" is used in most of the cases where the official is referred to. I suggest to the Senator it is a mere clerical error, and it seems to me it could be stricken out without being referred to the House.

Mr. GALLINGER. It could not.

Mr. WARREN. Let me say a word with respect to the suggestion that the report be printed. I desire to have it finished to-night, if practicable, for many reasons. I think the better way is to withdraw the report and for me to get into communication with the managers on the other side; and I will ask the Senators who have mentioned the fault to mark a bill, so that this later view will prevail, and I will try to arrange it. I shall be glad if later in the day we can take it up, so as to accommodate the Members on the other side, who have been exceedingly obliging, because two of those Members desire, for the best of reasons, to have the report considered over there in the morning.

Mr. CUMMINS. There are, however, two matters which are not mere clerical errors, upon which there is some difference of opinion. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota believes that the substitute of the managers means one thing; I am constrained to think that it means another, and it is so vital that I should like an opportunity to reflect upon it and confer a little upon it. For instance, this amendment says that all suits brought by or against the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be brought in such and such a district. Now, the very suits in which the people of this country are most vitally interested are the suits brought by the railroad companies against the United States for the purpose of canceling or annulling an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. WARREN. As Senators know, we can not compose those differences here. Either the report must be accepted or rejected, because if there are differences of that kind they can not be composed by any laying over or withdrawal or printing. I regret that there should be such a condition.

Mr. CUMMINS. I feel a very great interest in this phase of the case. I think we ought to have an opportunity to consider it carefully. I will be compelled to state my views with regard to the matter if a vote upon the report is asked at this time.

Mr. WARREN. What I suggested was that we let the matter go over until we meet at 8 o'clock this evening, and perhaps the Senator could, in the meantime, advise himself as to the true status of the matter.

Mr. CUMMINS. That would suit me. I already have an opinion in regard to it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It seems to me we can have an intelligent composition of our differences better after reading the report when it is in print than by considering them now. There are certain very important matters in this report, one relating to the civil service. I should like to see what the conferees have agreed upon in reference to that before action is taken upon the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. WARREN. What was the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion was that the report go over and be printed.

Mr. NEWLANDS. To what time will the report go over?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No time was designated.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Washington does not seem to be in his seat. Was it the Senator from Washington who made the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was the Senator from Washington.

Mr. WARREN. I was about to ask him to withdraw the motion, in view of the one or two words which Senators think should be corrected.

Mr. BORAH. I did not understand that the Senator from Washington asked that the report go over. He was about to

suggest it, when the Senator from Iowa finally himself made the suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Iowa made the motion. Is the motion withdrawn?

Mr. BORAH. It is under the control of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senate desires, let it go over. I have only to say that some of the Senators who have been at work on this for some weeks have to go into conference on another important bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has asked to withdraw the report temporarily, as the Chair understands.

Mr. WARREN. I am willing, on the request being made, that the report be withdrawn to correct, if possible, a word or two—what Senators, as they term it, deem a clerical error. I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw it for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent—

Mr. REED. Then it will be printed? That is understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to withdraw the report.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the report, and, if possible, to correct what Senators term a clerical error.

Mr. REED. Will it be printed when it is returned, so that we may read it?

Mr. WARREN. I will bring it before the Senate and—

Mr. REED. In order to save any question about that, I move that the report be printed.

Mr. WARREN. That cuts off my opportunity to make this correction, of course.

Mr. REED. Oh, no. I do not mean it in that way. If the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has withdrawn the report by unanimous consent. It is not before the Senate for a motion to print.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the report is withdrawn, it is not in possession of the Senate, and no motion can be made concerning it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so holds.

Mr. REED. I did not understand that unanimous consent had been granted. I do not care to stand on a technicality, however. I take it that the Senator, having asked to withdraw the report, when he presents it again will do so in such manner that we shall have an opportunity to have it printed.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 21279) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes.

Mr. BOURNE. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] had the floor when the conference report was presented.

Mr. REED. I understood the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] had the floor. I had the floor and yielded to him, and he addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President and Senators, I am very much opposed to the provisions of the House bill which a moment ago were being discussed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. If the Senate will bear with me for a few moments, I will try to tell, first, why I am opposed to the provisions of the House bill with regard to the sort of Government aid thereunder extended to public roads; secondly, what sort of provision it seems to me ought to take the place of it; and third, why it is perfectly clear to my mind, as it was to the mind of John C. Calhoun, perhaps the strictest constructionist of the Constitution that ever lived except Jefferson Davis, that the Government has a right to extend aid to post roads.

I am opposed to the provisions in the House bill because they are at once dribbling and driveling, and until something substantial can be done, I am in favor of the Government not attempting to do anything.

The Senator from Virginia says the provision of the House bill will stimulate the building of good roads. The Senator from Virginia is mistaken. The House provision will stimulate nothing except road supervisors to make proper certificates in order to get \$25 or \$20 or \$15 per mile per annum, and will result in no good at all to the cause of good roads.

The House provisions are a delusion, a snare, a farce, apples to the eye and ashes to the taste. They are a sop thrown out to Cerberus, the people, in order to keep them quiet upon the subject of building good roads.

The idea of contributing \$25 per mile per annum to this sort of a road—I must read the provision—a road to construct

which would cost from \$2,000 to \$2,500 per mile upon the average in the United States, and in my own country twice that amount, owing to the fact that the material would have to be brought long distances—a road “composed of shells, vitrified brick, or macadam.”

Under the House provision that road will receive an aid of \$25 per mile per annum. It is like saying when you go to improve the Mississippi River, let us say, that you will contribute a hundred dollars a mile, the hundred dollars to be spent each year on each mile of the course of the main stream. That is no way to build roads. You must make one road good, then you must make another good, and then a third and then a fourth. There must be some scheme whereby that could be done with fairness to the States and the several sections of the Union.

The next road is a road “well drained, composed of burnt clay, gravel, or a proper combination of sand and clay,” and so forth, and to that road there is extended the munificent aid of \$20 per mile. In my own county we have large and extensive gravel beds, and a good gravel road costs from twelve to fifteen hundred dollars per mile. That is a little bit over 1½ per cent, although I have not time to calculate it exactly.

Then comes class C, to which is extended the sum of \$15 per mile. It provides:

Class C shall embrace roads of not less than 1 mile in length upon which no grade shall be steeper than is reasonably and practicably necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, with ample side ditches, so constructed and crowned as to shed water quickly into the side ditches, continuously kept well compacted and with a firm, smooth surface by dragging or other adequate means, so that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles at all times.

That is an ordinary dirt road. To that is extended \$15 per mile, which comes nearer being a reasonable aid than the aid extended to any other class of roads under the bill.

These are the aids that are provided in this bill for the roads of the country. I submit that the aids are both driving and dribbling; that no human being with a particle of sense can believe they will be of any substantial benefit in road building; that the aggregate amount of money paid by the United States Government will be very large, and that the amount of money received by any mile of road will be infinitesimal; it will be negligible; it can do no good at all.

My own idea of how the Government should aid in roads, if it shall do it at all, is about this: The Government should contribute a lump sum per annum to be devoted to road building, upon condition that the State shall contribute an equal amount and the county, or in New England, where the township system prevails, the town, or in Louisiana the parish, shall contribute an equal amount, being one-third for each, because each shares in the benefits, and that lump sum should be divided and expended approximately in equal amounts in each State in proportion to the population of the State, excluding from the count cities of 100,000 population and over, so that substantial aid and assistance may be rendered. I want to be brief, and I shall not enter into the details of that proposition. I leave it to each Senator to amplify and to explain in his own mind.

The one point that I want to settle now beyond all doubt and peradventure is the constitutional right of the Federal Government to aid in road building, provided the roads are post routes. The clause of the Constitution to which I refer is in section 8 of Article I, and reads as follows, giving the powers of Congress, substantially the powers of the Federal Government, “to establish post offices and post roads.” That is the express language under which the Federal Government has undertaken to erect post-office buildings, and it is the only clause of the Constitution under which it could have erected a single post-office building in the United States. The words “post offices” are followed by “post roads.” If the phrase “to establish post offices” be construed, as it uniformly has been construed, to mean to build a post office, then to establish a post route also means to build a post road or post route.

One of the clearest arguments ever made in favor of that provision was made by the apostle of strict construction, John C. Calhoun himself. The question comes upon me rather as a surprise to-day; I wish I had his language and could quote it, but it was as clear and as conclusive as his utterances almost uniformly were.

Now, Mr. President, reasoning from the reason of the thing as well as from the direct language of the Constitution, the United States Government has never hesitated to aid in the construction of railroads. It aided in the construction of the transcontinental line, and based its action upon two grounds—the right to make interstate commerce easy and cheap and the right to establish a railway post route for the carriage of its mails. So this holds, even if I were forced to resort to an implied power—and no good Democrat ever denied the doctrine

of implied powers, as so many people have said they did. They have merely asserted that an implied power must be a necessary inference from an express power; that it must be necessary and not inferential by metaphysical reduction to the end of the limit. A railroad contributes in no greater kind, although in greater degree, to the facilities and cheapening of interstate commerce than a river, and our improvement of rivers has rested entirely upon that ground. It contributes no more in kind, though it does in degree, than does a country road.

The main reason why men who are so easily satisfied of the constitutionality of everything that can be jumped up have hesitated about acceding to the constitutionality of the power of the Federal Government to aid in post routes has been the fact that aiding in post routes seemed upon the surface of it to help nobody but small interests of a rural character. The real truth, however, is that good roads help everybody. They help the railroad and the water transportation companies more than anybody in the beginning. They help the ultimate consignee of the goods. They help the producer of the goods. The Federal Government has just as much right to aid in making interstate commerce cheaper and easier by aiding in the construction of highways without rails laid upon them as in the construction of highways with rails laid upon them.

My opposition to the House provision is that it is a delusion, that it is a snare, that it is a sop thrown out to Cerberus, that it will have a tendency to discourage the agitation for good roads and to make the people who have not time to follow the matter believe that they have something when they have nothing.

Although as a rule I am willing to take a half loaf where I can not get a whole one, I am not willing to take .0001 as a part of a loaf instead of an integer. This does not amount to 1 mill on the dollar, not one-tenth of 1 per cent, if I am figuring aright in my mind. I was afraid to say so, but I believe it is less than that. I believe that it goes to the next decimal. But whatever it may be, I want to assert the right of the common people of this country engaged in agricultural pursuits to the expenditure of some reasonable proportion of the immense amounts of money that are yearly spent, most of it, by the way, for absolutely unproductive purposes.

There is no better investment than a good road. It is not only an investment returning a dividend in money, it returns a dividend in school attendance, in church attendance, in neighborhood sociability, which have an effect toward higher culture. It returns a dividend in better morality, because there can be better enforcement of law and better attendance at church and at school. But I do want to warn the people as well as Senators of the fact that I can see nothing in these House provisions except an attempt to persuade me and men like me to convince ourselves that we have accomplished something. It is an old adage that a man is a criminal who fools another, but a man is not only himself a criminal but a fool who undertakes to fool himself, and I for one am not willing to try to fool myself with this sort of a sop.

I now yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 24450) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4663) granting to the Washington-Oregon Corporation a right for an electric railroad and for telephone, telegraph, and electric transmission lines across the Vancouver Military Reservation in the State of Washington.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18642) to reduce the duties on metals and manufactures of metals and further insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3 and 4 to the bill upon which the committee of conference have been unable to agree.

INCITEMENT OF INSURRECTION IN MEXICO.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] be appointed a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations in conformity with Senate resolution 335 authorizing the Com-

mittee on Foreign Relations to investigate whether any interests in the United States have been or are now engaged in inciting rebellion in Cuba and Mexico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] be appointed as an additional member of the subcommittee to make the investigation required by Senate resolution 335. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—SEMICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF EMANCIPATION.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise for a few minutes to a question of personal privilege.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will proceed.

Mr. BRADLEY. My attention being called to a severe stricture in a leading newspaper on my action the 24th of July concerning the amendment proposed by me to the sundry civil bill providing for an appropriation for the holding of the semi-centennial anniversary exposition, and for other purposes, charging, among other things, that I was guilty of mendacity, I therefore promptly reviewed the proceeding in the RECORD and discovered, much to my surprise, that misunderstanding a question propounded by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD], I had unwittingly given an incorrect answer. This grew out of my defective hearing, which at that time was greatly augmented by a cold. Showing the extent of that disability, I refer to the fact that although the presiding officer [Mr. GALLINGER] announced after the vote that the amendment had passed, misunderstanding his ruling, I called for the yeas and nays, whereupon he explained that the amendment had already been adopted.

It appears from the RECORD that the Senator from South Dakota, speaking of the exposition act, asked, "Did not that act itself make an appropriation?" to which I responded, "It did not." In offering the amendment I had in mind the fact that as the House had not passed the bill making the appropriation the amendment was open to a point of order, and hence I understood the Senator as making an inquiry concerning the action of the House, and when I made the answer expected him to raise the point of order.

It is no less than ridiculous to suppose that I should have answered his question in the negative with any purpose of misrepresentation, first, because nothing could have been gained by the answer, and, secondly, because three-fourths of the Senators present knew it was manifestly untrue. The bill had been thoroughly discussed preceding its passage by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HIRCHCOCK], and myself, and for this reason the fact that the bill carried an appropriation was, as I have said, well known to a large majority of the Senators present. The point of order of Senator SMITH of Georgia, on which the amendment went out, was that the Senate had passed the bill carrying an appropriation, which bill was then pending in the House and not acted upon, the failure to act in the House alone being material.

I am criticized in the article mentioned for attempting to procure an appropriation for the benefit of a private corporation.

The present bill is substantially along the lines of some others enacted heretofore providing for expositions. The object of the bill was public, namely, to "illustrate the history, progress, and present condition of the negro race and to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation of emancipation by President Lincoln," and was conditioned that the corporation having the matter in charge should raise not less than \$50,000 for the enterprise.

Showing the justice and propriety of the bill and the estimation in which it was held by the Senate, it is proper to add that it was, after amendments, reported favorably by unanimous consent, irrespective of party, by the Committee on Industrial Expositions, 10 members of which were present. Not only so, but after the bill had been thoroughly discussed in the Senate it was passed without a dissenting vote.

The sundry civil bill, as you all know, is passed toward the conclusion of Congress, and frequently where one branch has failed to act amendments providing for appropriations are passed by the branch which has acted, which amendments, when agreed upon in conference, render the legislation effectual. There was therefore no impropriety in the amendment proposed, and such amendments are frequently passed.

THE POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 21279) making appropriations for

the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no more doubt than the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] as to the constitutional power of the Government of the United States to establish post roads or aid in establishing post roads, but the question of the United States entering upon that policy is a very large question, indeed. If we are to enter upon it, it will involve the expenditure of many more millions than the Panama Canal will have cost, and it ought to be done, as the Senator from Mississippi pointed out, only after most ample consideration, and on a broad, well-understood, well-arranged plan, so that for the millions we expend we may get the value and the return we desire in good roads.

I do not propose to discuss the merits of that policy, but I do want to say a few words in regard to the proposition embodied in the bill as it comes from the House. I can not add materially to the argument made by the Senator from Mississippi against this clause, but I can add, I think, something in the way of illustration.

My objection to the House provision is that it is a sheer waste of money. It is throwing away \$16,000,000, which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] did not seem to think a very important sum. It is sixteen millions without the classification expense, without the expense of inspection. It is throwing it away. There will be no return. It will not be a stimulus to good roads; it will be a premium on the maintenance of bad roads in keeping them as they are.

Mr. President, the State of Massachusetts has gone into the improvement of the roads very extensively. The State roads of my State, I believe, to be as good roads as exist anywhere in the world; and I have been over the roads of France and England, which have a very high reputation. The State roads are as good in their construction as the park roads of the Government here in the neighborhood of Washington. The State has built 879.6 miles of State highways in Massachusetts. It has cost the State \$8,000,000 to build those 879 miles. It costs the State \$500,000 a year, between six and seven hundred dollars a mile, to keep those roads in good repair and in order.

Mr. President, a road of that character is, of course, the easiest road to keep in repair, owing to the fineness and perfection of its construction. In England, on the Continent, and in this country to keep a macadam road in repair after it has been built costs from \$250 to a thousand dollars a mile. To build those State roads which I am describing and which are, of course, much finer than the macadamized roads, costs in the neighborhood of from nine to ten thousand dollars a mile, for roads built as automobile roads, with oiled surfaces and all that.

The little town in which I live, the smallest town in area in the State of Massachusetts, has only 11 miles of road. It has maintained extremely good macadamized roads. It is also at the end of a star route, the mails being carried 4 miles from the city of Lynn to the village of Nahant, where I live. I have been familiar all my life with the appropriations for and the construction of the roads in that town. The average cost to that town of maintaining 11 miles of macadamized roads has been over \$10,000 a year. We had as good macadamized roads as there were in the State. The place is one to which many people drive in the summer, and many automobiles pass over the long neck of land lying between Lynn Bay and the Atlantic Ocean; and the automobiles destroyed those macadamized roads, good as they were, and it became absolutely necessary to rebuild them. To build 2½ miles of road fit to carry that automobile traffic, which is very heavy over those roads, will cost the town this year \$41,000. Those two and a half miles and a mile and a half more are traversed by a star route, and you propose to give that town \$100 to keep those 4 miles in order, when it now costs them a thousand dollars a mile to keep their macadamized roads in proper order.

The money would be thrown away on those roads, Mr. President. Nobody would know that the money had been spent. It would be a sheer waste. Where there is a fine road the amount is so trifling that it never would be heard of; it would be turned into the town treasury and lost sight of. Yet that is the amount proposed to be given for the best kind of roads; and when you come to the dirt roads, \$15 a mile, as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] said, would be like giving a hundred dollars a mile to maintain the levees on the Mississippi River.

It would be a sheer waste of money to take \$16,000,000 and spend it in this way. If we are going to have the United States enter upon a policy of good-road building, as we have an undoubted constitutional right to do, that is a great policy to be carried out in conjunction with the States, the cities, the towns, and counties in a proper manner after full consideration. It

will cost much more than \$16,000,000 to do anything effective; but when we expend whatever amount shall be determined upon we shall get returns; we shall get very many miles of good road every year, while under this proposed plan you would take \$16,000,000 a year and throw it away. You propose to give \$15 a mile to keep a dirt road in repair. It is only a premium to leave it a dirt road.

Mr. President, if we are going to enter on the policy of building good roads, let us enter on it in the spirit and in the manner which such a great policy demands and not with a helter-skelter appropriation which would simply waste the money of the Government and mislead the people of the United States into the belief that we are doing something in behalf of good roads when we are doing nothing of the kind.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, the question of good roads is a more important question in the newly settled regions than it is in the older portions of the country. What are called roads in New England are practically streets. The country is so thickly settled with villages and towns that you are only out of one to pass into another, and I can realize the importance to those people of maintaining the highest class of roads; but there is another class that bears a closer relation to the growth of the country, and that is the roads in the Western States without limit to the Pacific coast. We started with trails—long trails, with 20, 30, or 50 miles between places of consequence—over which the mail is packed on the backs of animals or carried upon the shoulders of men. In most instances we have developed those trails into roads traveled with vehicles, crude at first, but built at the expense of the people directly interested in their construction and maintenance, in order that not only the mails might be carried and that people might be able to pass from one section of the country to another, but in order that the commodities of the country might be carried to the markets and from one town to another, or from town or country to the lines of transportation.

We are intensely interested in the question of good roads, and we would welcome an era of construction and maintenance entered upon by the Government; but we do not want the Government to contribute to the construction and maintenance of dirt roads. When the Government enters upon this class of work it should be for the construction of roads up to the standard of the highest use, not all at one time, but continuously and gradually; not roads one part of which would be worn out before the other part was constructed, but a system of progressive construction that would result within a reasonable time in a system of permanent good roads.

That is the only system to which I would be willing to vote any money whatever. I would not vote a dollar for the repair of old roads by the Federal Government; I would leave that to the local governments. I would have a Government road constructed by the Government of such a character that it would be recognized as soon as noticed, so that the only expense thereafter would be the minimum expense of maintaining a good road. It costs infinitely less to maintain a good road than it does a bad road, and after you have maintained a good road you have something with which to be satisfied, while after you have maintained a bad road you are no better off than you were when you started. So that I do not believe the legislation upon which this system is to be based should be contained in an amendment to an appropriation bill. I believe we should have reports from competent engineers, embracing the whole system of roadways in the United States, and then, acting upon those reports, commence a systematic construction of roads. After they are constructed, I would see to it that adequate provision was made for their maintenance and repair. It would be easy to determine what was necessary, what force of men would be required, and the system of organization best adapted to the maintenance of those roads. While I am sincerely in favor of the construction and maintenance of roads by the Government, I am not in favor of entering upon a system that would only afford an excuse for condemnation and for final abandonment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks that portion of the pending bill relating to roads which is proposed to be stricken out by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be so ordered, without objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

That for the purposes of this act certain highways of the several States, and the civil subdivisions thereof, are classified as follows:

Class A shall embrace roads of not less than 1 mile in length, upon which no grade shall be steeper than is reasonably and practically necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, well drained, with a road track of not less than 9 feet wide, composed of shells, vitrified brick, or macadam, graded, crowned, compacted, and maintained in such manner that it shall have continuously a firm,

smooth surface, and all other roads having a road track not less than 9 feet wide, of a construction equally smooth, firm, durable, and expensive, and continuously kept in proper repair. Class B shall embrace roads of not less than 1 mile in length, upon which no grade shall be steeper than is reasonably and practically necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, well drained, with a road track not less than 9 feet wide, composed of burnt clay, gravel, or a proper combination of sand and clay, sand and gravel, or rock and gravel, constructed and maintained in such manner as to have continuously a firm, smooth surface. Class C shall embrace roads of not less than 1 mile in length upon which no grade shall be steeper than is reasonably and practically necessary in view of the natural topography of the locality, with ample side ditches, so constructed and crowned as to shed water quickly into the side ditches, continuously kept well compacted and with a firm, smooth surface by dragging or other adequate means, so that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles at all times. That whenever the United States shall use any highway of any State, or civil subdivision thereof, which falls within classes A, B, or C, for the purpose of transporting rural or star-route mail, compensation for such use shall be made at the rate of \$25 per annum per mile for highways of class A, \$20 per annum per mile for highways of class B, and \$15 per annum per mile for highways of class C. The United States shall not pay any compensation or toll for such use of such highways other than that provided for in this section, and shall pay no compensation whatever for the use of any highway not falling within classes A, B, or C: *Provided*, That in calculating or otherwise ascertaining the distance that mail is transported over any highway, such distance shall be measured or calculated in only one direction, and only one use of or travel over any such highway, or any part thereof, on any one trip by a carrier using the same, shall be considered. That any question arising as to the proper classification of any road used for transporting rural or star-route mail shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. That the compensation herein provided for shall be paid at the end of each fiscal year by the Treasurer of the United States upon warrants drawn upon him by the Postmaster General to the officers entitled to the custody of the funds of the respective highways entitled to compensation under this act, under and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General: *Provided, however*, That no payment shall be made under the provisions of this paragraph for the use of any privately owned or toll road.

The provisions of this paragraph shall go into effect on the 1st day of July, 1913.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there is a singular contrariety of views expressed by the Senators who oppose this measure, but they all succeed in developing the same philosophy, namely, that nothing is to be done for roads at the present time, and that the longer the adoption of any plan is delayed the better it will suit them. The House provision is very short and plain. It is not intended at one time to produce perfect roads; it is intended to encourage and promote the building of good roads. I believe if it is enacted into law the result will be a nationwide movement in the direction of road improvement.

One of the objections urged to this provision in the bill is that we should build no roads until we build permanent roads. Mr. President, there is no such thing as a permanent road; there has never been a permanent road constructed, and there never will be. There are roads which last longer than others, but if you build the highest class of macadam road it will, under heavy travel, speedily disintegrate. In the course of a few years, unless it is constantly repaired, it will become as bad as the original dirt road. The fact I assert is sustained by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge], who proclaims that some 10 miles of road near a city in his State has cost a thousand dollars per mile per year for maintenance. The Senator from Massachusetts states that it cost \$41,000 to construct 2½ miles of rock road in the State of Massachusetts. If it costs that much to build the so-called permanent roads, we might as well abandon the hope of ever having roads of that character, for the value of property in the farming districts of the United States would not sustain the burden. If the Government or the States undertake to improve the roads of the country at a cost of nearly \$20,000 per mile, the National and State Governments will be bankrupted and the plan will fail. The proposition of permanent roads to be built by the Federal Government is, therefore, a fallacy, if we adopt the standard suggested by Senators who have preceded me.

There is another question involved which I want to touch upon. If the Government of the United States proposes to enter upon the improvement of roads and adopts the plan of what have been termed permanent, that is to say, very high-priced roads, I want to know where those roads will be built, and the people of the United States will want to know where they are to be built. Manifestly such roads can only reach a small part of the country. Are you to construct one road across the country from east to west? If so, of what value will that road be to the people who live 40 or 50 miles away from it? Are you to construct another road from north to south? If so, of what value will that road be to the people who live a few miles from it? It is manifest if you start upon such a plan as that it will be years and years beyond the lifetime of any man now upon this earth before permanent roads constructed by the Federal Government can reach the great mass of the people of this country.

Furthermore, you will simply beget controversies between different States and different communities as to which one shall first receive the benefit of the permanent roads constructed by the Federal Government. It must, therefore, be manifest to all who consider the question that if we are to bring benefit to the people of the United States fairly, equitably, and justly, and have those benefits realized within the lifetime of men now upon this earth, some plan must be adopted which will reach into every community of the United States and encourage the activities of the people in the aggregate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to me? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. REED. With pleasure.

Mr. OVERMAN. Would it not be a better system for the benefit of the people if we were to take this \$18,000,000 and divide it among the States according to population? According to population, my State, which has 2,300,000 people, would get over \$400,000. If the State of North Carolina would supplement that with \$400,000, it would make, in the aggregate, \$800,000. Carrying the system down the line into the counties, if each county would supplement what the State gives to a double amount, and the townships would do likewise, by that means the State of North Carolina would have an income of more than a million dollars with which to build good roads. Would not that be better than to give \$25 a mile? Would not that produce a great system of roads throughout the United States? Missouri would get something like two or three million dollars on that basis, and would have a great road fund. Would not that, in the Senator's opinion, be a better system of road improvement?

Mr. REED. If I were to stop now and analyze the Senator's plan I would not be able to analyze this plan. The plan he outlines would be an improvement over some I have heard suggested here. There are objections to it, and if I have time later on I will call attention to them. But the point I want to challenge attention to at this time is that the great movement is on in the United States for better roads and the demand for Federal aid is Nation-wide. Federal aid will be granted by this Congress or by some other Congress in some form, and that before long.

The plan that is now submitted by the House of Representatives appeals to me for many reasons, and I want to present those reasons. I do so with fear and trembling, because the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], to whom I yielded a little while ago, informed us in language that was certainly sufficiently plain that "no human being with a particle of sense can believe that the bill will be of any substantial benefit." That language was so highly complimentary to the House of Representatives, which passed the bill by a decisive vote; to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who but a few moments previously had occupied the floor in earnest advocacy of the measure; and fell with such crushing force upon the spirits of all those who have ventured to indulge the notion that the House bill really did have some sense in it, that I feel it is an act of extreme temerity to take the floor and advocate the bill. However, I am somewhat reconciled to the sad condition in which the Senator's denunciation has left me by the fact that the Senator, further denouncing the bill, declared it to be only "a sop thrown to Cerberus, to wit, the people."

This is the first time I have ever heard the people of the United States catalogued with the dog-headed monster Milton placed on guard at the gates of hell. I venture the opinion that if the Senator from Mississippi continues to indulge in that kind of language regarding the people, after they have spoken at another election the Senator will be inclined to further refer to Milton, and in describing the people's protest to exclaim:

With wide Cerberian mouths full loud, they rung
A hideous peal.

I am astonished that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] should so vehemently oppose this bill. He comes from an agricultural State, where they need good roads as much as they are needed in other States. Kansas is a splendid State, but her population is widely scattered. The farmers of Kansas must reach their market places over the ordinary country dirt roads.

So far as I am personally concerned, I happen to live in a county that has nearly 300 miles of macadam road, which were paid for out of the revenues of that county. No one can deny that the rock roads of the county have added to the value of the farms four or five times their actual cost. And while I am upon that question I want to say there must be a singular way of letting road work in Massachusetts. If it costs \$41,000 to build 2½ miles of macadam road in Massachusetts, where

there is more rock to the square acre than any other place on earth, I can not understand why we are able to build rock roads in my State for from \$3,000 to \$4,000 a mile.

Mr. President, there has been a claim made here that for the Government of the United States to pay something to encourage good roads will destroy all of the rights of the sovereign States. That was the plea offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT]. If ever there was a place where the doctrine of State rights was absolutely upon foreign territory, it was when it found a place upon the lips of the Senator from New York. State rights! How are they invaded under this bill? Let us examine its language. Under this bill the Federal Government does not have the right to enter a single State, to stick a spade in a single road, to lay its hand of authority upon a single culvert, to do anything to a single bridge, to interfere in the slightest degree with a single local authority.

What the Federal Government does, all it is proposed it shall do is this: When the local authorities have brought a road up to a certain standard then, and not till then, the Federal Government takes action. What is that action? The Government simply pays a premium to the State authorities of \$15, \$20, or \$25 a mile, dependent upon the character of the road. If anybody will tell me how the payment of that money destroys the rights of sovereign States, how it strikes down those privileges reserved to the people of the States by the Federal Constitution, then he can tell me something which, indeed, I might characterize in the language of the Senator from Mississippi as a proposition which no man of sense can understand.

Mr. President, this doctrine of State rights which has been urged to-day by those who never defended it before, and never will again, has a strange sound. It is proposed by this bill that the Federal Government shall aid in improving roads over which the Federal agents, to wit, the carriers of the mails, travel upon Federal business. We are told if the Government appropriates some money for that purpose it destroys the rights of the sovereign States.

Ah, Mr. President, we did not hear that cry when under the claim of establishing and improving post routes the General Government granted of the public domain millions of acres to great railway companies. That was eulogized as an act of patriotism. The doctrine of State rights did not appear in ghostly warning before the predecessors of the Senator from New York nor stay the hand of his party when it looted the public domain and plundered the people under the pretext of aiding in the establishment of post roads.

Moreover, if it is an invasion of the doctrine of State rights for the Government to appropriate money to improve the country roads over which it carries the mails, what shall we say of the act of the Government when it expends millions of dollars to improve the rivers of this land upon the claim that they are public highways over which the mails and commerce of the country can be carried? If this appropriation of a few dollars to each county or road district in the United States will destroy the rights of these sovereign States, I ask why our rights have not already been destroyed by the fact that we have expended thousands of dollars of the public moneys to build canals over which the commerce of the land may go and the mails may be carried; why it is that the improvement of harbors lying along the coasts of Massachusetts and New York have not already sapped the independence of the States; why it is that Senators rise up in clamorous protest against the expenditure of this money to build roads to the farms of the land, claiming that thereby the rights of the sovereign States will be destroyed, when they have established a policy of taxing the farmers upon everything they put upon their backs and every implement of their husbandry for the benefit of mills and manufactures of certain other States? State rights, in the conception of these Senators, is a very good doctrine to get back of when they want to prevent the doing anything for the benefit of the farmers of the United States, but it has never yet stood in their way when they wanted to give the people's lands or money to the railroads. It has never disturbed them when they taxed the people of all the States for the benefit of the great monopolies of the East.

Mr. President, the same influences fight this measure, which proposes to do something for the farmers, that fights for every measure that proposes to levy a tribute upon the farmers. I, of course, do not apply that remark to those who are honestly in favor of road improvement, but who take exception to this particular plan and think a better one can be adopted, but I do apply it to those gentlemen who are always willing to put their hands into the Public Treasury when there is some-

thing to be done for the great cities of this country or the great manufacturing industries of their particular communities.

Mr. President, let us see what a frightful thing this bill is. It is said it will take \$20,000,000. That is less than the price of two battleships equipped; it is about the price of two battleships unequipped. Its influence, if those who advocate it are not mistaken, will be felt in every hamlet and village of the United States. Its benefits, if those who advocate it are not mistaken, will be participated in by every man, woman, and child of the United States. Each good road in the country lessens the labor and cost of bringing goods to town; you can not build a good road in the country but you encourage men to go from the cities to the farms.

The cause that is to-day denuding the rural districts of their population is found principally in the fact that there are so many difficulties attendant upon farm life which do not go with city life. Each time you build a better road between the farm and the town you make the farm a more desirable place of residence. Each time you induce a family to remove from the city to the country you help to reduce the cost of living in the city. When the time comes that splendid roads lead from every city and village to every farm of the land, when the telephone reaches all farmhouses, and the trolley lines cut across all parts of this country, you will find that men and women will want to return to the country where they can enjoy the beauties of country life and at the same time enjoy some of the advantages of city life. So that when you build these roads to the city the benefit is not limited to the country, the benefit is not limited to the farm alone; a corresponding benefit flows to the inhabitants of the city.

Mr. President, let us look at this bill just as it is, not as it has been pictured in the vain imaginings of men who have not read it or who do not choose to discuss it fairly. I will admit frankly that no plan or scheme of this kind can possibly be entered upon where objections do not rise to confront us. But I also insist that if we forever pause in the presence of all objections, we will never make a beginning, and consequently we can never hope to make an end of the enterprise.

Let us look at the bill just as it is: First, it is not true, as was urged here by opponents of the measure, that the moneys to be paid under this bill will simply be handed over to road overseers and by them squandered so that no benefits will be realized by the Government or the people. The Senators who make that objection have not read the measure or do not choose to understand its terms. There is no attempt here to turn this money over to road overseers and permit them to waste it and give nothing in return. The proposition contained in this bill is that when a road has been brought up to a certain standard and has been maintained at that standard, that then, and not until then, the money shall be paid. A Federal authority passes upon the question whether the road has been brought up to that standard. And so, Mr. President, I insist that it is unfair to make the statements that have been made, and that such assertions are in the face of the bill itself.

The language of the bill is expressed:

The United States shall not pay any compensation or toll for such use of such highways other than that provided for in this section, and shall pay no compensation whatever for the use of any highway not falling within classes A, B, or C.

That any question arising as to the proper classification of any road used for transporting rural or star route mail shall be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Not by a road overseer, but by a Federal authority.

That the compensation herein provided for shall be paid at the end of each fiscal year by the Treasurer of the United States upon warrants drawn upon him by the Postmaster General to the officers entitled to the custody of the funds of the respective highways entitled to compensation under this act.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] yield to me that I may present a conference report on the legislative appropriation bill and ask to have it printed?

Mr. REED. I yield for that purpose.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WARREN. I submit the conference report on the legislative appropriation bill (H. R. 24023) and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

RECESS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri will kindly suspend. The hour of 6 o'clock having arrived, the Senate stands in recess until 8 o'clock this evening, under the order already passed.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., on the expiration of the recess.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BURNHAM. Mr. President, I present a conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill. I desire to have it printed in the Record without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire presents a conference report and asks that it be printed in the Record without reading. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18960) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 42, 57, 58, 72, 73, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 111, 120, 124, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 155, 170.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 70, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 91, 93, 98, 99, 100, 108, 110, 112, 114, 118, 119, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 165, 166, 167, 168, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 179, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$1,217,866"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "the," where it occurs the first time in the amendment, strike out the words "exhibition of animals"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$1,670,316"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$8,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$52,430"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$80,765"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$35,795"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with

an amendment as follows: After the word "demonstrations," strike out the word "in" and insert the words "and for"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$125,000" and add thereto the following: "Provided, however, That the sum of \$50,000 of this amount, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for the purchase of land and equipment and the construction of buildings necessary to establish, equip, and maintain an experimental farm in the northern section of the Great Plains area to demonstrate the kind and character of plants, shrubs, trees, berries, and vegetables best adapted to the climate and soil of the semiarid lands of the United States: *Provided further*, That the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$1,658,080"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$2,323,580"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by said amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed and required to select, classify, and segregate, as soon as practicable, all lands within the boundaries of national forests that may be opened to settlement and entry under the homestead laws applicable to the national forests, and the sum of \$25,000 is hereby appropriated for the purposes aforesaid"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the amendment, after the word "forests," insert the following: "but it is not the intent of this provision to restrict the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the free use of timber as provided in the act of June 4, 1897"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$170,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by said amendment insert the following: "And the Secretary of Agriculture shall investigate the best methods of distillation of Douglas fir and other northwestern species of fir and timber and ascertain the yields of distillates of various species, and the refining and commercial use of the distillates"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$20,180"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$165,640"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by said amendment insert the following as a new paragraph:

"That an additional 10 per cent of all moneys received from the national forests during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912,

shall be available at the end thereof, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails within the national forests in the States from which such proceeds are derived; but the Secretary of Agriculture may, whenever practicable, in the construction and maintenance of such roads, secure the cooperation or aid of the proper State or Territorial authorities in the furtherance of any system of highways of which such roads may be made a part."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$3,107,285"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$5,343,045"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$968,940"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$30,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$328,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$672,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert the following as a new paragraph:

"For the establishment of a national game preserve, to be known as the Wind Cave National Game Preserve, upon the lands embraced within the boundaries of the Wind Cave National Park, in the State of South Dakota, for a permanent national range for a herd of buffalo to be presented to the United States by the American Bison Society, and for such other native American game animals as may be placed therein. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire by purchase or condemnation such adjacent lands as may be necessary for the purpose of assuring an adequate, permanent water supply, and to inclose the said game preserve with a good and substantial fence and to erect thereon all necessary sheds and buildings for the proper care and maintenance of the said animals, \$26,000, to be available until expended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$45,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$166,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$191,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 152, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$194,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said

amendment insert "\$219,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by said amendment insert the following: "And that the Secretary of Agriculture be and he is hereby directed to secure from the various branches of the department having authority to investigate such matters, reports relative to systems of marketing farm products, cooperative or otherwise, in practice in various sections of the United States and of the demand for such products in various trade centers, and shall make such recommendations to Congress relative to further investigation of these questions and the dissemination of such information as he shall deem necessary"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 164, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$1,871,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "\$16,264,496"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by said amendment insert the following: "To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the cultivation, acclimating, and development of the most nutritious and productive types of potatoes, and for the purpose of experimentation and development of American sugar-beet seed adapted to the irrigated lands of the arid West, \$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert \$16,651,496; and the Senate agree to the same.

HENRY E. BURNHAM,

F. E. WARREN,

J. H. BANKHEAD,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOHN LAMB,

A. F. LEVER,

G. N. HAUGEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

VANCOUVER MILITARY RESERVATION, WASH.

Mr. WARREN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4663) granting to the Washington-Oregon Corporation a right for an electric railroad, and for telephone, telegraph, and electric-transmission lines across the Vancouver Military Reservation, in the State of Washington, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 3.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1 and 2, and agree to the same.

H. A. DU PONT,

F. E. WARREN,

JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JAMES HAY,

S. H. DENT, Jr.,

JULIUS KAHN,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 21279) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, we have had a discussion of this section in the Post Office appropriation bill by several Senators, but by none from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads,

who favor the committee amendment as against the provision in the House bill. I joined with the majority of the committee in the opinion that it is not wise at this time, if it ever shall be, to adopt the provision contained in the bill as it passed the House. What I shall have to say will not detain the Senate long, but in brief outline I desire to state the considerations which led the majority of the committee to the conclusion they reached.

It will be noticed by an examination of the House provision that while there is a provision as to the roads falling in the classes A and B, and the width of the road is prescribed, as to class C there is no requirement as to the width of the road. A little further examination into class C roads will, in my judgment, lead to the conclusion that this was not an oversight on the part of the framers of this House provision, because, as it is said:

Class C shall embrace roads * * * with ample side ditches, so constructed and crowned as to shed water quickly into the side ditches, continuously kept well compacted, and with a firm, smooth surface, by dragging or other adequate means.

And there is this remarkable conclusion to that provision:

So that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles at all times.

I assume it will not be disputed that almost any of these 2,000,000 miles of dirt road are passable for wheeled vehicles.

The objections to the provision of the bill briefly stated are these. First, it is considered to be impracticable. The Chief of the Office of Good Roads of the Agricultural Department appeared before the committee in opposition to the House provision. He stated that in order to protect the Government it would be necessary to have inspections of these roads. Many of the roads falling under class C are clay roads. In fact, that is one class of roads designated specifically as falling within class C.

It must be admitted, Mr. President, that the Government can not have an inspector go every day or every week or every month or every quarter over these country roads. The most that can reasonably be expected is that an inspector will get over the roads about once during a year.

Now, a clay road in dry weather is as good as a macadam road, and in wet weather it is the worst road imaginable. So it will work out that if the inspector strikes a part of the country in dry weather in which the roads are clay he will approve the road as being entitled to the benefit of this provision of the act, and when he goes into another part of the country during the wet season he condemns the road as not complying with the provision of the act. Yet one road is equally as good as the other and equally as much entitled to be compensated for as the other.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the bill does not provide for any kind of inspection of roads?

Mr. BRYAN. It does not provide for any kind of inspection. Mr. OVERMAN. Some roads in my state are bad in the winter time and in the summer time they are fine. Is there no provision as to how the roads shall be inspected?

Mr. BRYAN. No, sir. So if the inspector goes into North Carolina in the wintertime and inspects their roads none of them will pass, and if he goes into Alabama in the wintertime in dry weather they will all pass.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the bill provides that when there is a dispute between the Post Office Department and the local authorities as to whether a road has measured up to the requirements, and if they are not satisfied with the ruling of the Post Office Department, then the Secretary of Agriculture can make an examination to ascertain as to whether the road measures up so as to obtain the money.

Mr. BRYAN. That is one of the most humorous features of the bill. I heard the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] a short while ago say, in answer to what was stated by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], that if no superintendent kept one of these roads up to the standard the Secretary of Agriculture would do it. Can the Senator from Virginia tell me how the Secretary of Agriculture of this great Government can perform the duties he is required to perform and at the same time during his vacation find leisure to inspect over a million miles of dirt roads?

Mr. SWANSON. Since the Senator has asked me the question, I can answer it very easily. There goes over every one of these roads every day a star-route contractor or a rural-delivery carrier. They are anxious to have good roads, because they can do their work more easily and more cheaply.

The Post Office Department can require them every week and every day, if it sees proper, to make a report to that department as to the condition of the road over which they pass. It has over every one of these roads an individual under the pay of the Government—under the control of the Government—giving it daily inspection—daily examination in going over it. Consequently the department can require its officer to make his report. It seems to me that I know of nothing the Government pays for where it has such an efficient quick way to get daily inspection as it has under this bill over rural-delivery routes and over star routes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. How could the Secretary of Agriculture get that information from them?

Mr. SWANSON. I will tell you how. All these reports come in from the rural carrier or the star-route contractor. If the roads are not sufficient to justify the payment of the money, and a dispute arises as to whether the money shall be paid or not, then the Agricultural Department can have the power to go there and settle it. But I am willing to adopt an amendment, and leave it to the Post Office Department to pass on it and let its decision be final, so far as the expense to be incurred is concerned. I favor that in preference to having the Agricultural Department finally pass on it.

When the Government erects a public building it has an inspector there daily in its pay to see whether there is good material put in the building or not, but the Government, in this case, has a man in its pay subject to its order, a man interested in reporting a bad road and having it improved, and the department can require him to make a daily report if it sees proper.

Mr. BRYAN. I think if the Senator from Virginia takes time to reflect, he will himself be convinced that there are several other amendments which he also might be willing to accept to the bill.

Mr. SWANSON. I am not talking about other amendments. I favored that in committee for the simple reason that I believe the inspection will be done better by traveling over it by Government officials under the control and subject to the rules and regulations of the department, officials who are interested in reporting bad roads, and that it would be a very good guaranty to the Government that it would not pay for any roads except the roads that are good.

Mr. BRYAN. At least the Senator from Virginia has abandoned the idea that the Secretary of Agriculture must personally inspect all these roads, and it now comes down to this, that he will depend upon the star-route contractors and the rural-mail carriers.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, every star-route contractor—

Mr. BRYAN. I should like to finish this one point, and then the Senator can—

Mr. SWANSON. I will not interrupt the Senator further unless it is agreeable to him. Besides, the Post Office Department has now four or five hundred inspectors subject to its control. They yearly visit the star routes to see whether the boxes are properly located and to hear all complaints and to see that the rural carriers discharge their duties. If there is any complaint that a road is not satisfactory, there is already a large force of inspectors who go over these routes two or three times a year to see that the rural carrier does his duty. The same inspectors could also see as to the condition of the roads and report on their condition.

Mr. BRYAN. So it comes to this in the end, that the roads will have to be inspected. If it would be necessary to use inspectors in addition to those already employed, then there would be that much additional cost.

That brings me to a consideration of a statement made by the Chief of the Office of Good Roads before the committee. The Senator from Virginia thinks that the officer is prejudiced against good roads, and especially against this bill, but as I understand his position he is heartily in favor of Federal aid to good roads, but he does not believe this is the character of bill that should be adopted by Congress.

He said that in the beginning it would cost \$700,000 to have these roads inspected and classified, and that annually thereafter it would cost \$200,000 to have them inspected once a year. In the report of the House committee, and it is undoubtedly true, they expect every one of these roads used for rural routes to come within one of the three classes.

Now, Mr. President, if we are going to have a rigid inspection, I undertake to say that a very small percentage of the country roads will come even under class C. If the inspection is to be a mere formality, and, as indicated by the report of the House committee, all these roads are to get under class C, then I submit that the spending of the \$700,000 in the first place and the

spending of a quarter of a million dollars annually in the second place is a useless waste of money.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to ask the Senator from Florida a question. Of course, he knows who the rural free delivery carriers are in our country. Can he imagine a rural free delivery carrier incurring the enmity of the county road supervisors and contractors by reporting their roads to be in a bad condition and have the Government cut off the payment of \$20 a mile?

Mr. BRYAN. I think a man would have highly imaginative powers to conceive anything of that kind.

Mr. SWANSON. Can you imagine a rural free delivery carrier reporting a road in good condition, splendid and passable, when it might be inspected a week afterwards by a general inspector who would ascertain that he had made a false report, and he would stand the risk of being dismissed from the Government service for having sent in false reports to the Government?

Mr. WILLIAMS. He could very easily say it was in good condition when he made the report, but bad when the inspector got there.

Mr. BRYAN. He would say it had rained in the meantime.

Mr. SWANSON. It will be the reverse. Instead of the carrier reporting the roads good the usual custom has been to report them bad to give an excuse why they did not bring the mail in properly to meet the train. A rural carrier has a certain schedule. If he reports that the roads are good he has to make the schedule on a good road, and if he does not make the schedule in time it could not be any excuse that the roads were bad.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will ask the Senator from Virginia whether in a part of Virginia and a part of North Carolina the roads are not for about six months very bad and for about six months very good? Would they be entitled to this \$10 or \$15 for the whole year or would they only get half of it for half a year?

Mr. SWANSON. It is the proportion for the time the roads were kept in good order.

Mr. OVERMAN. But half the year the roads would be good and half the year they would be bad.

Mr. SWANSON. You get paid for all the time that you keep the roads in good order. You would get compensation for the good work you did, and no pay until you got the roads in good order and rendered good service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How long does the provision require good roads before they can receive anything?

Mr. SWANSON. The provision speaks for itself. I suppose the Senator has read it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My recollection is that it is 12 months.

Mr. SWANSON. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask the Senator for information.

Mr. SWANSON. My opinion is that if you get the entire pay it must be for the entire 12 months.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought from my reading of the bill that it had to be for at least the specified time. Let us look that up.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, if it be true that it is the intention that all these roads used for the carriage of mails over rural routes are to be beneficiaries of this provision we might as well be frank about it, and instead of paying money for useless inspection provide that there shall be paid to the State treasury of each State the amount which would come under the provisions of the bill in proportion to the rural routes in that State.

Now, to those Senators who to-day have argued so strenuously for the farmer and for the man who lives in the country and on these rural routes, who are so anxious to see this system extended so that all of those who do not have the opportunity and the benefits of rural route at all, I submit this proposition:

On the average standard route there will be an additional expense of between four and five hundred dollars, for which provision must be made, so that it will add to the present requirements about 40 per cent; and thereafter when you appeal to the Post Office Department to establish an additional rural route the Postmaster General must figure that it will cost 40 per cent more than heretofore. I submit to the judgment of the Senate whether present routes can be extended and new routes put in as rapidly with this provision as without it.

There is another question which is involved in any good-roads measure we may pass. I apprehend it has been in the past perhaps one of the causes of the postponement of this matter. Here is a small State with a large population and small

area; here is a large State with large area and a small population; one has good roads and one has bad roads; what is fair as between those States? The State of small area, large population, good roads, and few rural routes would receive a relatively small proportion of the appropriation, while a State of large area, small population, bad roads, and many rural routes would receive a relatively large proportion of the appropriation. Let me illustrate that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me for a moment, we were talking a moment ago about a matter in connection with which I want to read a provision of the bill. If anybody can make heads or tails out of it, I can not. It is as follows:

That the compensation herein provided for shall be paid at the end of each fiscal year by the Treasurer of the United States upon warrants drawn upon him by the Postmaster General to the officers entitled to the custody of the funds of the respective highways entitled to compensation under this act under and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed jointly by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General.

There is no provision at all for any division of money in proportion to the number of months that the road has been kept good; there is no provision requiring that the road should have been good for any specific time prior to the payment. That is all that is in the bill about it.

Mr. BRYAN. There is a provision further back, in the same section, which says payments shall be paid at the rate of \$15, \$20, or \$25 per year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is per mile.

Mr. BRYAN. Per mile.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; it is provided that compensation shall be paid at the end of the fiscal year, but there is nothing to justify the assertion that if the road was good six months and bad six months \$7.50 would be paid.

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, it is impossible, as I said, probably before the Senator came in—

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will allow me a moment, there is nothing which prescribes any specified length of time during which the road shall have been good prior to payment.

Mr. BRYAN. In a wet winter the roads may be bad and almost impassable, yet at the time the inspector comes—and he can not come but once a year, and is not expected to come oftener—they may be in good condition and so will be allowed payment for the year, and necessarily so. I agree with the Senator from Mississippi that a rural-route mail carrier living on the route, a citizen of the community he is serving, securing his position because of the indorsement of his neighbors, anxious to see all the money possible given to his community, is not going to be unusually active in reporting cases where the roads fall below the standard fixed by the Post Office Department.

Now, Mr. President, I want to illustrate the statement I made when the Senator from Mississippi last interrupted me. Perhaps I had better repeat that statement. It was that a State of small area, large population, good roads, and few rural routes would receive a relatively small proportion of the appropriation, while a State of large area, small population, bad roads, and many rural routes would receive a relatively large proportion of the appropriation.

The State of Massachusetts has an area of 8,315 square miles, a rural-route mileage of 6,673, and a population of 3,366,416. Forty-nine per cent of the roads in Massachusetts are improved roads, and under the provisions of this bill they would get about \$100,000. The State of Texas has an area of 265,780 square miles, a rural-route mileage of 45,751, and a population of 3,896,542, slightly in excess of the population of Massachusetts; yet the improved roads in Texas are only 3.3 per cent of the road mileage of the State. Missouri has 69,415 square miles of area, and would be entitled to draw under this bill for 48,810 miles of rural roads. She has a population of 3,293,335, and 4.41 per cent of her roads are improved; so that both Texas and Missouri would get from seven and a half to eight times as much as the State of Massachusetts, although the improved roads in both Missouri and Texas fall below 5 per cent of the total road mileage, while the roads of Massachusetts are 49 per cent improved.

States of relatively large area, large population, and few rural routes would receive a relatively small proportion, while States of relatively small area but many rural routes would receive a relatively large proportion, although the percentage of the good roads in each did not materially differ. Take Texas again, a State of large area and large population, but, as compared with some States, of relatively small mileage of rural routes. Kansas has an area of 81,000 square miles, 49,000 miles in rural routes, and 1,690,000 population—less than one-third of the area of Texas, less than half of the population of Texas—but would get \$50,000 more money per annum, although the

roads in Texas are improved 3.80 per cent and the roads in Kansas are 0.38 per cent improved. Iowa, with a smaller area than Kansas, 55,000 square miles, with a larger rural-route mileage, 60,000 miles, and with a slightly larger population, 2,200,000, would get \$110,000 more than Kansas and \$150,000 more than the State of Texas.

Mr. President, Senators interested in this matter would find House Document 582 of the present session interesting reading. It was prepared by the Department of Agriculture in 1900. On page 40 of that document is a valuable table, giving, by States, the total mileage in 1904 and 1909 of improved roads and the percentage of all roads improved. After the committee had considered the House provision and had heard a large delegation from the other House, appearing in behalf of the bill, the Chief of the Office of Good Roads appeared to oppose the provision or to give his opinion; I believe he was under subpoena by the committee; I do not think he volunteered to come.

After hearing his testimony it occurred to me that it would be valuable to know the mileage by States of rural-route roads. Information had been given already—and it can be found in some of the reports by the Chief of the Office of Good Roads or some other officer of the Department of Agriculture—as to the number of routes by States, but not the mileage by States. I requested him to get up that information for me. He did so after considerable trouble and some time. I have taken from this House document information bearing upon this particular question, and have taken from his report the rural-route mileage by States. I have added to that the area of each State in square miles, and also the population, so that Senators can take this table and at a glance ascertain about what their States would be entitled to under this appropriation, and from a study of it they will be convinced, in my judgment, that it would not be fair or proper to pass such a provision as this upon the idea that we are undertaking to encourage the building of good roads.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to ask the Senator whether it would be possible under any system that would square with the Constitution to avoid the inequalities or matters of disproportion to which the Senator has been referring in his discussion; in other words, is it not absolutely necessary, in order that such a provision have any constitutional basis whatever, that it rest upon the mileage of the roads in the States which come under the designation of post roads? If in a small area like Massachusetts or Rhode Island they have, owing to the density of population, a very large mileage of post roads, while in a State of vast geographical extent they may have a comparatively small mileage of post roads, nevertheless the expenditure of Federal funds must, in the nature of things, rest upon the fact that the road is a post road, and, consequently, the inequalities, concerning which the Senator is addressing himself, are inevitable if we embark upon the enterprise at all.

Mr. BRYAN. If the Senator will allow that question to remain in abeyance, I shall reach it before I conclude.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Very well.

Mr. BRYAN. I was explaining this table and had finished doing so.

Mr. President, I think it is hardly fair to the committee to say that the report which it has made and the amendment which it has submitted indicate that the committee is opposed to Federal aid to good roads. As I am speaking somewhat for the committee, I may say that the committee itself, as a whole, favor Federal aid to good roads. I am of the opinion that money has to be collected somewhere before it can be spent; and that whether the Government spends it or the State spends it or the county spends it, it has to be taken out of the taxes of the people; but the committee recognizes the fact that there is a demand for Federal aid to good roads.

The proposition we had before us was as to which method should be favored by the committee. Starting out with this proposition, which means an expenditure of millions upon millions of the people's money, it occurred to the committee that to have a subcommittee of the Senate and of the other House take 90 days to investigate this plan and other plans—some plans submitted here to-day—would not be a matter that could be justly criticized by anybody.

So far as I am concerned, I do not believe that the farmers are demanding hasty and ill-advised legislation. I was much amused by the remark of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] that some here in this body would vote and had voted to donate to the railroad companies millions of acres of public lands to enable them to build railroads and now would not vote

any money to enable the farmers to have good dirt roads or hard roads. Senators, the oldest Member here is older than I think he is if any of the present membership of this body was sitting in the Senate from 1850 to 1860 when those acts of Congress were passed.

Mr. President, the farmers have never yet asked any special favor at the hands of this Government, and that we will do justice by them is all they want and all they ever will ask.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the Senator from Florida takes his seat—

Mr. BRYAN. I had not said anything about taking my seat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was very much interested in the tables which he had. The State of Iowa, the State of Mississippi, and the State of Indiana are pretty nearly the same area. If the Senator does not object, I should like to have him read the figures for those three States—Iowa, Indiana, and Mississippi—so that they may appear in his speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in juxtaposition one with another.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes; I will be very glad to do that.

Mr. Page, Chief of the Office of Good Roads, outlines this position. While upon investigation it might be determined that it ought not to be adopted, yet it is worthy of consideration. Before I come to that, I will comply with the request of the Senator from Mississippi.

Indiana has 51,175 rural-route roads; 24,955 miles of improved roads. The percentage of all roads improved in 1909, 36.70; population, 2,700,876.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What amount would Indiana get under this plan?

Mr. BRYAN. Indiana would get three-quarters of a million.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Three-quarters of a million.

Mr. BRYAN. Iowa has 60,020 miles of rural routes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now?

Mr. BRYAN. And would get \$900,000; percentage of improved roads, 2.45, as against 36.70 in Indiana, and she has a population of 2,224,711. Mississippi has 18,570 miles; percentage of improved roads, eighty-six one-hundredths of 1 per cent; population, 1,797,114.

Mr. WILLIAMS. She would get how much?

Mr. BRYAN. Mississippi would get about \$300,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mississippi would get \$300,000. Iowa \$900,000, Indiana three-quarters of a million, or \$750,000.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. I know the Senator from Florida does not wish to leave a wrong impression upon the Senate. His figures are correct to this extent: That is limited to the rural routes, but this provides also for star routes. In sections of the country where there are a great many rural routes there are very few star routes. Of course, putting in rural routes takes off certain star routes. Star routes deliver now to some extent like rural cars, by depositing the mail in the road box. This bill provides for paying for star routes.

The average star route in the United States is 13 miles, and there are about 160,000 miles of star routes. They would be paid by this bill. The right way to make the estimates is to add the star-route mileage to the rural delivery routes.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me explain that right now. The reason the star-route mileage was not placed in the rural-route mileage is that so many of the star routes are over water.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One word, if the Senator will pardon me.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator will wait a moment. There are so many of them over water that it is hardly to be supposed that under any classification at all they could come within the provisions of roads entitled to receive under class C.

I want to ask the Senator from Virginia if in his remarks he has incorporated this table?

Mr. SWANSON. I have.

Mr. BRYAN. Then I will not incorporate it in mine.

Mr. SWANSON. Does not—

Mr. BRYAN. Let me say this: It would make very little difference so far as the three States to which reference has been made are concerned. I will put that in right now.

Indiana has 99 miles of star route; Iowa, 55; Mississippi, 309.

Mr. SWANSON. You will see how it is equalized, as I have suggested. The average length of a star route in the United States is 13 miles, and I presume the average in Mississippi would be the same as elsewhere. If you will multiply 300 star routes by 13 it would give the number of miles in Mississippi which would be paid for.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the star routes in Mississippi are mainly on the Mississippi and other rivers.

Mr. REED. Mr. SWANSON, and others addressed the Chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators will be in order. Does the Senator from Florida yield, and to whom?

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I understand the Senator from Florida in figuring the distribution of this money has taken the number of miles of star routes and rural routes.

Mr. SWANSON. No. Rural routes.

Mr. REED. Rural routes; and he computed upon that basis the amount coming to each State. Is that correct?

Mr. BRYAN. That is correct.

Mr. REED. Now, Mr. President, he might as well have figured on the problem based upon the railroad mileage of a State. This bill does not propose at any place to pay a certain amount per mile upon the rural routes, and that is what the Senator figured on. This bill proposes to pay upon the number of miles of road that are improved and brought up to the specifications of the bill. Accordingly, a State might have 10,000 miles of road and 5,000 miles of rural routes and not get one dollar under this bill, and another State might have 500 miles of road and might collect on every mile of it, if it was improved to the proper standard and that entire mileage used as a rural route. So that the figures so painfully prepared by the Senator have not anything to do with the case at all.

Mr. BRYAN. Of course, that is always the last refuge of a man who can not answer an argument.

Mr. REED. I have not answered it. I have demolished it. There is not anything left of it.

Mr. BRYAN. I know the Senator has, in his opinion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say to the Senator from Florida that if he will permit one more interruption I will try to let him alone.

The Senator from Missouri thinks he has demolished; he is absolutely confident of the fact that he has murdered Macbeth; but the truth is that under this bill a State may receive fifteen or twenty or twenty-five dollars a mile for each mile of road that it brings up to a certain stage, and the possibilities of its receipts are limited by the number of rural routes in the State. So that Iowa could receive \$900,000 Indiana could receive \$750,000, and Mississippi could receive only \$300,000, if all three improved up to the Agricultural Department specifications every mile of road they had that was a rural free-delivery route.

Moreover, one more word. I have had experience enough here in Washington to know that the States which are doubtful politically receive rural free-delivery extensions and accommodations much more than the States which are not doubtful.

Mr. BRYAN. It is a fact disclosed by the table of figures I produced that with States having practically the same area, practically the same population, some have a very small number of rural delivery routes and some relatively a very large number. I use that simply as one argument to show that it is a difficult proposition to undertake to divide fairly and equitably this appropriation between the States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand your table, it does not undertake to show what each State actually would receive, but the possibilities of receipt in each case.

Mr. BRYAN. I am of the opinion that if the Department of Agriculture could, by employing a sufficient number of inspectors, hold each community rigidly up to the requirements of this bill, make every road be maintained throughout the year with smooth, compact surface, the only States that would be benefited would be those having roads of a high grade. But no man can read the report and the debates upon this question and come to any other conclusion than that it is the intention to give these rural routes the benefit of this bill under classification C.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BRYAN. Just one word further on that; and if this bill does not do it, it is inevitable that as this system grows the demand will be so great that every rural route, regardless of whether it comes up to any specification or not, will receive the benefits of this act. That is bound to come; and if so, I would vote for it, because I can not see a difference between a road which shows wheel tracks and one which does not; and if the Government should pay rent for the use of the road, there are sand roads which show wheel tracks just as good as and better than clay roads that would not do it in dry weather.

Now I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. It is a little tardy now to say what I wanted to say.

Mr. BRYAN. I hope the Senator will realize I can yield to only one Senator at a time.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes. I am not complaining. I am thanking the Senator for his courtesy.

The defect which I sought in my humble way, and in my ignorant way to point out in the argument of the Senator from Florida, was that he had based his calculations not upon the

number of miles of road that would be improved or that were now improved, so that they would come within the provisions of this bill, but he had based his conclusions upon the number of miles of road that now happen to be used for rural routes. I thought I had made that plain until the Senator from Mississippi took the floor and accused me of having convinced myself and nobody else.

Now, I do not expect to convince the Senator from Mississippi. I have never known him to be convinced after he had once taken a position; but as he is generally right, and as I generally agree with him, I am always content that he should maintain his opinion. I am now. But I call attention to the fact that what the Senator from Florida was doing was to give us a mathematical deduction based upon certain figures, and that now both the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Mississippi have abandoned mathematics and have gone into the realms of possibilities, and they are talking now about what it might be possible for the State to get, and not answering the point I sought to make that these figures were misleading because they depended upon a wrong basis.

While I have the floor, with the courtesy of the Senator from Florida, a word further on that point. The rural routes in any State may be extended or contracted at any time. The rural-route system has not yet by any means been fully established or completed. There may be States that have been unfairly treated; but I take it that those inequalities will be removed speedily, particularly after the 4th of next March. But how futile it is to stand and argue that because one State to-day has more rural mileage than another that that is a reason why we should not improve any of the roads. I am directing my attention now simply to that one argument, and I shall take pleasure, when I resume my remarks, to spend some little time on it.

Mr. BRYAN. Of course it is my fault, but there is nothing in what I intended to say that would deceive anybody about that table. I said frankly that if the roads under class C are rigidly inspected they would not come within this provision, and I invite the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the debates and the report where it is estimated that it will cost \$18,000,000.

The Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Virginia, who argued strenuously for the House provision, should have a conference, because the Senator from Virginia argued that the postponement for a year would give all of the States an opportunity to come within the provisions of the act and have their roads up to the standard of class C by the time the act goes into effect in 1914.

Now, Mr. President, when I was interrupted, I was about to outline the plan recommended by the Chief of the Office of Good Roads. Two or three Senators here to-day have advocated the plan of the Government building the roads. The plans recommended by this officer of the Agricultural Department is that a board of engineers in consultation with the State authorities shall lay out a system of roads in this country, estimated at 33,000 miles.

It is estimated that 33,000 miles of road would be reasonably sufficient, and if the State would build roads as outlined up to a certain standard the Government would then undertake to keep them up to that standard. I was surprised to hear him say that a road costing \$10,000 a mile required an expenditure of \$1,000 per annum to keep it in condition. It seemed like a large sum, but he stated that upon an investigation of the accounts of the State of New York on roads costing \$10,000 a mile the average was \$1,000 per annum. So I was not surprised to-day to hear the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] make the statement that it took about a thousand dollars per mile to keep up the splendid roads in his State. I am not undertaking to oppose Federal aid to good roads, but believing that this provision in the House bill is not the last and final word of wisdom on this subject, it appeared better to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to propose instead the following amendment:

That a joint committee shall be appointed, composed of three members of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and three members of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to be designated by the respective chairmen thereof, to make an inquiry into the subject of Federal aid in the construction of highways, and report at the earliest practicable date, and said committee shall have power to employ such clerical and stenographic assistance as may be necessary and conduct hearings, and for the payment of the expenses of such inquiry there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$5,000, to be paid upon vouchers signed by the chairman of said committee.

I think it is well for Senators to understand that this committee of three members of the committee of each House are instructed to report at the earliest practicable date, and that if we are going into this tremendous business we will have some information and be in a position to do a larger degree of justice

at least to the States affected, and at least it can be said that if any sensible plan is adopted it will go into the roads and not into the hands of township or county roads supervisors in a way that does not require the spending of a single dollar upon the roads.

I was not surprised by the statement of that man that the only way roads are maintained after they are built is to have a central authority, as a State engineer. County commissioners do not keep up the roads when they build them. They build a road to one community to satisfy it and to another community to satisfy it, and in the endeavor to satisfy various communities the roads theretofore built have gone to pieces and the money is thrown away.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Will the Senator from Florida allow me?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I want to correct the Senator in that statement. My own State of New Jersey is noted for its superb roads. We are fairly gridironed with them. We are a small State, it is true, but we have something like 800 miles of roads there, and they have been built by the county system. Our roads run from the line of one county to the county line of another, and are taken up by the supervisors or freeholders under the supervision of a county engineer. The roads do not blow away, but they are put there to stay by our county commissioners. We have a State-aid law and the State contributes a certain proportion to the building of our roads.

I want to disabuse the Senator's mind of the thought that because they are built by the various counties they are necessarily poorly and miserably built.

Mr. BRYAN. I hope the Senator from New Jersey understands that I was stating the argument of the Chief of the Office of Good Roads before the committee.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I thought it was the Senator's own argument.

Mr. BRYAN. Of course we all know that New Jersey is an exception to the rule.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. We have a model road man, I am frank to say, and a model in many other ways; and I am happy in the thought that that will be recorded as the great consensus of public opinion in a few months. But, as to the road system, I do believe that our system is about the perfection of road making.

Mr. BRYAN. I am very glad to have the statement of the Senator from New Jersey incorporated in my remarks.

Now, I have detained the Senate much longer than I expected.

Mr. SWANSON. Before the Senator concludes, I should like to show this great disparity he has made between Mississippi and Iowa, and to give a striking case of gross and glaring injustice. I want to explain how this works out, and I want to show what the most glaring disparity amounts to.

In Mississippi there are 18,570 miles of rural routes. Suppose that all of them were put under class C, and all were in class C at \$15 per mile, Mississippi would receive \$278,550.

In Mississippi there are 779 star routes, and where there are a great many rural-delivery routes there are more star routes. The star-route average in the United States is 13 miles. So there would be in Mississippi 10,127 miles of star routes which would receive \$151,905. The aggregate amount received by Mississippi would be \$430,455.

Mississippi has a population of 1,790,000 in round numbers, and Mississippi would receive 24 cents per capita for every citizen in the State.

Iowa has a great many rural delivery routes and very few star routes. In Iowa there are 60,020 miles of rural delivery routes, which, figured at \$15 per route, would amount to \$630,100. Now, having a great many rural-delivery routes, the whole State of Iowa has 55 star routes which, at 13 miles each, would amount to 915 miles, and at \$15 a mile it would amount to \$9,225 per star route, making the aggregate in Iowa, if these figures are true, \$639,325.

Iowa has a population of 2,240,000. Divide the amount received by the population of the State and every man, woman, and child in Iowa would get 28 cents, or 4 cents per capita more than Mississippi.

Iowa has 55,000 square miles and Mississippi has 46,000 square miles.

That is a most glaring exhibition of disparity.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I wish to put a question to the Senator from Virginia. In the distribution of the estimated amount that would have to be appropriated by the Government for the purpose of building good roads in the several States, I should like to know, under this calculation of the Senator from Virginia,

how much of the \$20,000,000 would go to the State of New York. I can tell about how much the State of New York would contribute.

Mr. SWANSON. How much does the Senator think it would contribute?

Mr. O'GORMAN. About a sixth or a seventh of the entire amount.

Mr. SWANSON. That would be about \$3,000,000. Now, if the Senator from Florida will permit me further, there are 79,279 miles, and you would get about a million and a half, I assume. This is one of the advantages—

Mr. BRYAN. I do not yield for an argument, Mr. President.

Mr. SWANSON. The only way you can build up—

Mr. BRYAN. I decline to yield further.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida declines to yield further, and he will proceed.

Mr. BRYAN. All I have to say in reply is that it is difficult to argue with a man who in multiplying \$60,000 by 15 makes only \$600,000 instead of \$900,000.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I prefer to take the figures of the Senator from Florida to the figures of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask permission to insert at the end of my remarks a table showing number of rural routes, rural-route mileage, road mileage, and so forth, in the United States, by States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

The table referred to is as follows:

Number of rural routes, rural route mileage, road mileage, etc., in the United States.

State.	Number of rural routes, 1912.	Rural route mileage, 1912.	Road mileage, 1909.	Mileage of improved roads, 1909.	Percentage of all roads improved, 1909.	Area in square miles.	Population, 1910.
Alabama.....	1,019	24,335	49,639	3,263.93	6.58	51,279	2,138,093
Arizona.....	11	256	5,987	273.00	4.56	113,840	204,354
Arkansas.....	419	9,630	26,445	1,085.25	2.97	52,525	1,574,449
California.....	382	8,818	48,069	8,587.75	17.87	156,092	2,877,549
Colorado.....	154	3,992	29,693	320.50	1.08	103,658	799,024
Connecticut.....	279	6,111	12,583	3,030.54	24.08	4,820	1,114,756
Delaware.....	107	2,528	3,000	186.44	6.22	1,965	202,322
District of Columbia.....	7	149				60	331,069
Florida.....	202	4,786	17,579	1,752.35	9.97	54,861	752,619
Georgia.....	1,640	38,967	82,230	5,978.00	7.27	58,725	2,609,121
Idaho.....	119	2,921	18,403	510.50	2.77	83,779	1,325,594
Illinois.....	2,856	69,025	94,141	8,914.00	9.47	56,002	5,638,591
Indiana.....	2,121	51,175	67,996	24,955.75	36.70	35,885	2,700,876
Iowa.....	2,424	60,020	102,427	2,505.10	2.45	55,586	2,224,771
Kansas.....	1,811	49,240	98,302	374.71	.38	81,774	1,690,649
Kentucky.....	735	17,102	53,744	10,114.95	18.82	40,181	2,289,905
Louisiana.....	182	4,246	24,962	329.50	1.32	45,409	1,656,388
Maine.....	468	10,695	25,528	2,703.06	10.59	29,895	742,371
Maryland.....	437	9,767	16,773	2,142.32	12.77	9,941	1,295,346
Massachusetts.....	301	6,673	17,272	8,463.18	49.00	8,039	3,366,416
Michigan.....	2,031	49,757	68,906	6,900.54	10.01	57,480	2,810,173
Minnesota.....	1,594	42,258	79,323	5,416.85	6.83	80,838	2,075,708
Mississippi.....	782	18,570	39,619	342.25	.86	46,362	1,797,114
Missouri.....	2,099	48,810	107,923	4,755.50	4.40	68,727	3,293,335
Montana.....	49	1,236	23,319	95.00	.41	145,776	376,053
Nebraska.....	1,052	28,037	80,338	248.55	.31	76,803	1,192,214
Nevada.....	3	68	12,751	46.00	.36	109,821	81,875
New Hampshire.....	238	5,372	15,116	1,448.48	9.58	9,031	430,572
New Jersey.....	303	6,792	14,842.00	3,377.86	22.76	7,514	2,537,167
New Mexico.....	16	440	16,920.00	104.00	.61	122,503	327,301
New York.....	1,902	43,740	79,279.00	12,787.36	16.13	47,654	9,113,614
North Carolina.....	1,306	29,858	48,285.00	2,313.00	4.79	48,740	2,206,287
North Dakota.....	534	15,481	61,593.00	140.00	.23	70,183	577,056
Ohio.....	2,530	60,193	88,861.00	24,106.00	27.13	40,740	4,767,121
Oklahoma.....	1,037	27,877	71,325.00	361.00	.50	69,414	1,657,155
Oregon.....	231	5,624	29,475.00	2,799.25	9.49	95,607	672,700
Pennsylvania.....	2,203	50,663	87,386.79	3,364.76	3.84	44,832	7,665,111
Rhode Island.....	43	943	2,120.75	1,042.07	49.14	1,067	542,610
South Carolina.....	775	18,193	32,075.00	3,534.75	11.02	30,495	1,515,400
South Dakota.....	565	16,471	56,354.00	236.00	.50	76,898	583,888
Tennessee.....	1,604	37,882	45,913.00	5,353.50	11.66	41,687	2,184,789
Texas.....	1,924	45,751	128,971.00	4,896.00	3.80	262,398	3,896,542
Utah.....	51	1,102	8,320.00	1,018.00	12.23	82,184	373,351
Vermont.....	340	7,497	14,406.00	2,650.03	18.40	9,124	355,956
Virginia.....	1,015	22,520	43,390.00	1,902.75	4.38	40,262	2,061,612
Washington.....	304	7,366	34,283.60	4,520.68	13.19	66,836	1,141,990
West Virginia.....	370	8,259	32,109.00	591.40	1.84	24,022	1,221,119
Wisconsin.....	1,644	40,464	61,090.00	10,167.33	16.64	55,256	2,333,860
Wyoming.....	10	287	10,569.00	416.00	3.94	97,594	145,965
Total.....	42,199	1,021,447	2,199,645.14	190,476.32	8.66	3,026,789	91,972,266

¹ Average per cent.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I was a little late when the Senate reconvened and hence did not have the opportunity to continue my remarks in order, and now that I have heard a good deal of this debate I am rather glad I was late, because the debate makes manifest the necessity of doing just what I was attempting to do when the Senate took its recess, namely, the analysis of the bill so that we may clearly understand just what the bill actually does propose to do. I had, when the hour of adjournment arrived, reached the point of demonstrating, at least to my own satisfaction—I do not include my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]—the fact that the road overseer is not the man who determines when the money shall be paid or whether the road has been kept up to the standard, but that these facts are determined by a Federal authority. The language of the bill is so plain there can be no dispute.

I come now to the question that was under discussion as I entered the Chamber, namely, whether these roads must be kept up to the standard during the entire year or only a portion of the year, and whether if kept to the standard only a part of the year the payment would be prorated and paid for the period of the year during which the road was maintained.

Mr. President, if I understand this bill, there is no question of prorating in it. In order to receive any pay under the bill

the road must be brought to a certain standard and kept at that standard continuously throughout the year. I think that is plain from the reading of the bill itself.

Class A is defined, and I quote from the bill—

Class A shall embrace roads of not less than 1 mile in length—

And so forth—

Here follows a description of the materials—

crowned, compacted, and maintained in such manner that it shall have continuously a firm, smooth surface.

Class B shall embrace roads—

And so forth—

Describing the materials—

constructed and maintained in such manner as to have continuously a firm, smooth surface—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. In a moment; when I get to the end of my sentence.

Class C shall embrace roads—

And so forth—

crowned so as to shed water quickly into the side ditches, continuously kept well compacted and with a firm, smooth surface by dragging or other adequate means—

Mr. OVERMAN. Right there I should like to ask the Senator—

Mr. REED (reading)—
so that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles at all times.

Mr. OVERMAN. Right there I want to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. REED. If the Senator will wait until I get through with this sentence, I will yield then.

Now, that does not mean for one day in a week or one week in a month or one month in year. It means just what it says—"continuously."

Mr. OVERMAN. That is what I wanted to ask the Senator.

Mr. REED. Yes. Will the Senator wait until I conclude the paragraph, and then I will yield to him—

That whenever the United States shall use any highway of any State, or civil subdivision thereof, which falls within classes A, B, or C, for the purpose of transporting rural or star-route mail, compensation for such use shall be made at the rate of \$15, \$20, or \$25 per annum per mile for highways.

Now, that language, all taken together, means that the Government shall pay \$15, \$20, or \$25 per mile for such mileage as shall have been continuously maintained, not intermittently maintained, not occasionally maintained, not sometimes maintained, but continuously maintained at the particular standard specified.

Now I yield to either of the Senators.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wanted to know really the Senator's construction of that section, because he seems to differ with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON].

Mr. REED. I do, most emphatically.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask the Senator from Virginia as to our red hills in Virginia and North Carolina, when a part of the time we have bad roads and a part of the time good roads, whether we get the money in the State for half the time. As I understand the Senator from Missouri, these roads have to be kept continuously in good repair before we get any money at all during the whole year.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. So when they are muddy and impassable in the wintertime those roads would get nothing.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think we want to discuss this bill with an effort to get at just what it means. It is an important matter. We may in the good nature of debate, and in an effort to try to get a little temporary advantage, sometimes reach a little over the line, but in the end we must come to the merits of the bill. This bill was not prepared altogether by amateurs. Some pretty sensible men sat down in the House for a long time over it, and the more you study it I think the more you will find the House committee met every question.

Now, let me show the Senator from North Carolina, if I can, how they met this very question with reference to the dirt roads of his State. The language of the bill, in defining class A, which is a road constructed of shells, vitrified brick, or macadam, is that it shall be continuously a firm, smooth, rounded surface.

When you come to class B, which is also a hard-surface road, composed of burnt clay, gravel, or a proper combination of sand and clay, sand and gravel, or rock and gravel, the bill requires that it shall be constructed and maintained in such manner as to have continuously a firm, smooth surface.

Those two kinds of roads must have continuously a firm, smooth surface throughout the year, because they are hard roads and can be maintained throughout the year hard and smooth and firm. Now come to the third class, which is dirt road, and observe the language there. It shall be—continuously kept well compacted and with a firm, smooth surface by dragging or other adequate means—

Not so that it shall be hard and kept continuously hard, but this is the language:

So that it shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles at all times.

So that it is only required that a dirt road at every season of the year shall be reasonably passable for wheeled vehicles, but it is not required that a dirt road shall at all seasons of the year be perfectly smooth and perfectly hard. Thus the House committee provided a sensible rule for the dirt roads, viz, they must be at all times reasonably passable. I believe the provision meets thoroughly the question asked by the Senator from North Carolina. Nothing impracticable is required.

The House committee, I think, are quite as wise as any United States road overseer, by whatsoever name he is technically known, who says it takes a thousand dollars to keep each mile of rock road in repair each year, because, speaking of the country at large, I know that a man who makes that kind of a statement does not know anything about road building or road maintenance. We have 300 miles of rock road in my county, nearly half as much as there is in the entire State of

New Jersey, according to the statement of the Senator from that State. We have been building those roads for 15 years, and our experience has been that approximately \$250 a mile annually will keep them in excellent condition, although they lie in a county contiguous to a large city where the traffic is two or three or four times what it is in the more sparsely settled portions of the State. Any statement of any man that it takes on the average the country over a thousand dollars a mile annually to maintain a gravel or rock road is the mere vaporing of one who does not know his business as well as an ordinary country road overseer, who has been so mercilessly denounced by the opponents of the House provision.

Now, Mr. President, we get down, then, to this: Where there is a rock road it must be kept smooth and hard throughout the year; where there is a gravel or shell road it must be kept smooth and hard throughout the year. That kind of road can be traveled in all sorts of weather. A good road of that kind is actually better immediately after a dashing rain than it is after a long dry spell. There is no difficulty in traveling it. When you come to the dirt road the requirement is that it shall be kept reasonably passable and that it shall be constructed in a certain manner. The results of actual experience on that kind of road in my State—of course, soil differs, climate differs, conditions differ; and I can not speak for the entire country—but in my State a road that is ditched, properly constructed, and regularly dragged as it ought to be will be reasonably passable throughout substantially the entire year. So that the men who framed this bill did it with some wisdom and with some foresight and did take into consideration varying conditions and the different kinds of roads.

I come now to the next objection urged, which is that it will cost much money to determine whether a road is up to the standard or not. In reply, I say that if the certificate of the local road overseer should be falsely made, if the certificate of the county court or board of supervisors should be falsely made, if the certificate of all the local authorities should be false, you have yet left the certificate of the rural delivery carrier who passes over the road two or three times every day. It has been said the rural deliverer is a local man, and that he will be controlled by local influences, and therefore he will not tell the truth about the road he must travel over every day of his life; and so Senators sit here in much the frame of mind that the old prophet was when he said in his heart, "All men are liars," and they add, "All men are cowards"; but is their argument true with reference to the rural route carrier? As a matter of fact, he generally lives somewhere near his route, often in a small country village or a little country city. He has to travel his route each day. He drives his own horse. If the roads are not maintained, he can not deliver his mail or is obliged to overwork his horse and overtax himself. Under such conditions the rural carrier will be the first man to file a complaint against that road and try to have it brought up to the proper standard. But over and above all that is the fact that at very small expense the United States Government, through its post-office inspectors and its army of employees, can easily determine whether the roads are kept to the standard.

But the objections I have just discussed apply with the same force and to the same effect to every plan for road improvement that can be devised in the brain of any man in the Senate. All plans for road improvement involve some plan of inspection.

I come now to another argument, that there will be an unequal distribution of these funds among the respective States. That is a very seductive argument to offer to the man who comes from a small State. This provision is a part of a post-office measure, and if we were to get down to the kind of argument I am replying to we could apply it to the entire Post Office bill and to the entire Post Office system. So, we might find it argued here that we ought to abolish the Post Office system, because under it Delaware does not get as much benefit, does not have as much mail delivered to it, and does not have as much money spent within its borders as is expended in the Empire State of New York or in the great principality of Texas. Why, sirs, that argument is a boy's argument, because if you use it at all you must apply it all along the line; and when you do, you strike at every appropriation the Government makes for internal improvements, because if you apply it in one case you should in all.

Moreover, it is a narrow argument—an argument so narrow that I hesitate to take the time of the Senate to answer it. A man in the city of New York mails a letter which is to be delivered in a remote portion of Mississippi or of Texas. That man pays 2 cents to send his letter. He is interested in the rapidity and certainty of its transmission. He therefore receives a benefit from every good road that is built, infinitesimal of course, but out of these infinitesimals are made the great

aggregate of benefits conferred by the Postal Service. On the other hand, the man in the remote districts of a State or Territory is interested in having his mail speedily delivered to the city or delivered to another State, and he, in turn, acquires his fair share of the advantages that flow from good roads. Thus to the people of the United States in the aggregate accrue the aggregate benefits of this bill, each citizen getting his share as nearly as such benefits can be distributed. Mr. President, is it any argument against improving the roads of this country to say, "Well, Delaware would not get as much as Texas"? That argument would stop every kind of improvement. It would halt governmental projects at each State line in order that it might apportion its expenditures not according to necessities or benefits but according to population.

The Government of the United States does not maintain a Post Office Department, sir, for the benefit of the States. The Government of the United States when it establishes a post office knows no State line; it does not enter the States as States, but it starts upon its business and it pursues its business as an agency not of the States but of the sovereign citizenship of the United States of America, and it comes in no other capacity. When it does so, it trenches not upon the rights of a State, for it is within the constitutional powers which were conferred upon it when the people founded the Government.

Mr. President, so much for these narrow arguments. Before I conclude my remarks, I feel that I ought to reply briefly to the argument of my good friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW]. Generally he is not only of the people and for the people, but he is, in fact, the voice of the people calling, like "the noise of many waters," for their rights. Yet when he stood here this evening opposing this provision he told us that the Government had "already been very generous to the people in establishing rural routes"; that "it is preposterous to ask the Federal Government to do more for the people." Thus he pictured the Federal Government as an entity outside of and separate from the people of the United States, going down into its coffers and conferring largess and benefactions upon the people of the country. Why, sirs, what is the Federal Government? It is only the agency of the people of the United States created by the people for the use and benefit of the people; and as long as it serves the people it has a right to exist. When it ceases to serve the people there will no longer be excuse for its existence.

Whence came these benefactions that the Government has been conferring upon the people? From whom were they obtained? What benefit, what largess, what charity did the Government bestow upon the people of the United States when it established the rural routes? It took some of the people's money and expended it for the benefit of the people. That is what it did, and that is all that it did. I greatly fear that, if the Senator from Kansas lives much longer down here in Washington, he will really conclude that he is the Government of the United States, and that when he votes the people's money for the benefit of the people he is conferring a special favor upon them and bearing the expense himself.

Mr. President, this is the people's money. These roads are to be used by the Government in the exercise of its agency for the people.

The only question that ought to be discussed here is whether this plan is the best one we are able to conceive.

I started to say a while ago, and I say now, that I do not profess to claim that this is necessarily a perfect measure. Objections can be made to any bill that is offered; every scheme and plan that can be devised will be met with objections; but all we can do, as human beings, is to thrash out these objections, reason together, and try to arrive at a just conclusion.

It has been argued here that this plan will involve a vast amount of Federal inspection; it has been urged that the money will be wasted; and in that argument the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has taken a conspicuous part; yet I hold in my hand a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by the Senator from Mississippi when a Member of that body. I challenge attention to his bill, and I ask the Senator now if it is not open to many, if not all of the objections that have been insistently advanced against the bill under consideration? The Williams bill was introduced in 1907, and I compliment the Senator from Mississippi upon the fact that at that early day he was interested in the Federal Government assisting in the building of roads. I shall not read the bill in a spirit of criticism, but rather to show that it contains some of the very provisions contained in the bill under discussion which the Senator has to-night so vigorously criticized. That bill provided:

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury at the end of each fiscal year to take an account of all the funds in the Treasury

of the United States, and after deducting from said sum the amounts required by law to be kept in said Treasury, the remainder, if any, shall be declared a surplus.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to provide immediately for the distribution of said surplus, not exceeding \$25,000,000 annually during the continuance of this law, on a per capita basis to the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia—

I pause there long enough to say that that means an unequal division among the States—more unequal than would result probably if the money was distributed according to the mileage of rural routes that are improved; but it is a minor criticism. The division had to be based on something, and I do not think that a bad basis. I read again:

to be computed from the last general census taken by the national authorities, and shall prorate the same accordingly, for the sole purpose of improving the postal roads in said States, Territories, and District of Columbia.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, like the present bill, the Senator based the distribution upon the fact that the Government had established the postal routes of the country. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pursue his investigations further, he will find that the gentleman from Mississippi, at that time a Member of the House of Representatives, after that introduced another bill as a substitute for that, for the purpose of correcting the glaring inequalities of basing the distribution per capita, and provided in the subsequent bill that in computing the population of each State the population of cities of 50,000 souls and over should be subtracted from the total.

Mr. REED. Very well. The statement of the Senator simply shows that I was wrong a little while ago when I said he never changed his mind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Mississippi is notorious for changing his mind whenever a sound argument is presented.

Mr. REED. Very well; let it rest at that. The bill proceeds:

For the sole purpose of improving the postal roads in said States, Territories, and District of Columbia, under such rules and regulations as the States, Territories, and District of Columbia may provide.

That left the distribution to the governments of the States, and the governments of the States could provide for distributing it among the road overseers if they saw fit without any limitation, without any restriction, without any protection as far as we have thus far got in the bill. There is more of the bill, and I am going to be fair and read the rest of it:

And said Secretary shall immediately notify the governors of said States and Territories and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the amounts due each, and that the same will be paid over to such person or persons as may be duly authorized by said States, Territories, and the District of Columbia to receive and receipt for the same.

SEC. 3. That should any State, Territory, or District divert said funds for any purpose other than the improvement of the postal roads that they shall not be allowed to participate in any further distribution of said funds until said State shall show to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that a like amount so diverted has been expended from the treasury of said State, Territory, or District, so diverting the same in a judicious manner upon the postal roads of said State, Territory, or District diverting the same.

SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of the governors of the several States and Territories and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make a full and complete report to the Secretary of the Treasury on the 15th day of November, each year, what legislation, rules, and regulations have been adopted for the expenditure of said funds upon the postal roads, the manner in which the same has been spent, and the results accomplished. And it shall be the duty of said Secretary to submit said reports to Congress on the first day of each regular session.

Here we have been challenged because this bill did not provide for cooperation, that was said, although the first proposition of the present bill is that there must be not only cooperation, but that cooperation must be in advance and must bring the work up to a certain standard. But in the bill which was introduced by the learned and distinguished Senator, then the leader of the House of Representatives, provided for absolutely turning this money over to the various States and left it to the local authorities to expend it upon roads, how, when, and where they would, and did not require contribution or cooperation to any extent whatever. And yet the bill does the Senator honor, because he was a pioneer in this great scheme; at least in the revival of this great scheme that found expression in that provision of the Constitution which provided for the establishment of post roads.

Now, Mr. President, if it was wise and prudent when the Senator from Mississippi introduced his bill to turn the Government's money over to the several States, not in proportion to the mileage of their roads, not in proportion to the extent of their territory, not in proportion to the density of their population, but in proportion to population, what becomes of the argument that this bill is unjust, because under it those States with

large populations, large area, and large rural-route mileage will receive more money than the States with small area, population, and rural mileage?

Mr. President, I have quoted this bill for the purpose of showing that no plan can be devised even by the wise and cunning brain of my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi, whom I so much admire, which does not contain the very inequalities of the present bill against which he so dramatically inveighs.

Mr. President, one word further. They tell us that this money will be expended by road overseers, and that road overseers will squander it. I will answer that argument now. I do not know why men should go outside of the record in a case to argue matter that never was put in evidence. I do not know why men, in arguing a bill, should go outside the plain terms of the bill and discuss something that is not contained within its four corners. The fact of the matter is, that the provision of this bill requires the road overseer or the authority that has charge of the road, by whatsoever name known, to bring these roads up to a given standard and to maintain them at that standard. That embraces the cooperation of the States. That does away with any possibility of the road overseers squandering the money. That gives you the result in advance. After you have the result, after the goods, if you please, are laid upon the counter, you pay. To abandon my poor metaphor and stick to the text, after the road has been laid out, improved, and kept in condition then there goes into the funds of that district this little premium for the improvement of the roads. What is wrong with that?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Before the Senator finishes his argument, in order that we may have a clear comprehension of the facts in dispute as to the cost of roads I desire to state that I have here the department's bulletin of February 29, 1912, showing the mileage and cost of public roads in the United States of the standard type of sand and clay, the gravel, and the macadam road, and if the Senator will allow me I will read the figures as to just a few States.

In Alabama the sand and clay road costs \$680 per mile to construct up to the standard; in California, \$412; in Florida, \$829; in Georgia, \$387; in Kansas, \$785; in South Carolina, \$415. I believe Georgia was the lowest. The average cost of construction of a standard, well-kept sand and clay road in the 34 States enumerated is \$723 per mile.

Now, here is your gravel road. In some of the States it costs only \$940 per mile, but, taking into consideration that in some places the gravel is scarce, the average is \$2,000 for the gravel road. For the macadam road it is as low in some States as \$2,000 and as high in some as \$7,000, but the average is only \$4,000 per mile. The bituminous used on streets costs \$10,000; I suppose that was the road the Senator from Massachusetts was referring to. I just thought I would give these official figures in order that the Senator's argument might contain the exact facts.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator for these figures. They are very illuminating. Mr. President, I have very little to add, except that I want to drive home the argument that this money is not given to road overseers to waste. I repeat that the money is paid after the work is done and inspected. Let us, then, make an end of the talk that the money will be wasted by rural overseers—not because of my assertion, but because it is the plain language of the instrument itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the Senator from Missouri goes farther—and I very much dislike to disturb him—

Mr. REED. You do not disturb me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator has read a bill which I introduced some time in 1907, and in justice to myself I want to say a few words right here concerning it. It will not take me long. This bill, Mr. President, was my first; somewhat crude groping for a plan to help any good-road construction throughout the United States. One reason why it was drawn as it was is because at that time the Government had a very considerable surplus, so that two ideas contributed in the construction of the bill. One the old ideas of the distribution of the surplus to the States, which is familiar to the history of our country, and the other the construction of roads. The Senator will notice this bill only applies so long as there is a surplus in the Treasury. Now, when you come to the idea of returning a surplus to the States, it is but right and proper that the surplus should be returned per capita, no matter for what purpose it is returned.

Later on I introduced a bill which more nearly expresses my present convictions, although even that did not do it. I would

not reintroduce this bill to-day, nor would I the last bill which I introduced in the House. So far from its being difficult for me to change my opinion, I find it rather difficult to keep from changing it too often as I grow older and learn more. Finally I introduced a bill which differed from this in this respect: First, that in computing the population of the States, being no longer a distribution of the surplus, but the main object being the roads, cities containing over a certain number of souls should be deducted. I have forgotten whether it was fifty or one hundred thousand. Then I had likewise come to the conclusion that I had made another error in the bill, and that was in not providing that the aid extended by the Federal Government should not be above a certain percentage of what was paid out by the local authorities. I, therefore, provided that the Government should not pay the money into the State treasury unless the State made a satisfactory showing of having spent twice that much; in other words, the Federal Government would be contributing 50 per cent of the total cost and after the work was done.

To-day, if I were to introduce another bill, I would change the proportion to be paid. I would have the Federal Government contribute only one-third, and the State one-third, and the local community, county, or town one-third. But I would keep the other provisions of the bill, and especially this provision which the Senator from Missouri does not seem to have understood the reason for. I do not think the Federal Government ought to go into a State and build or repair roads.

Mr. REED. I understand that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that its agency in that respect should be confined to helping the States do the work. Now, believing that, I did not want to concoct any sort of machinery by means of which the Federal Government could undertake to visit a penalty upon a State or by means of which it could tarnish or hurt the good name of a State. Nor did I, upon the other side, want the State to accept money for one purpose and use it for another, as was notoriously done under the swamp-land grant act of our early history. I, therefore, wanted the Federal Government to keep a string upon the State, but with due respect to its absolute sovereignty. I, therefore, provided that where a State did not show to the Secretary of the Treasury—and in my later bill I believe I changed it to the Secretary of Agriculture where the Good Roads Bureau was, but to the Federal authority at any rate—that the money had been expended for roads and had not been diverted to other purposes, then that particular State should not receive any more money until it had restored that money to the roads of the State. Just the same provision that is in this bill. I say that merely in justice to my own position upon that bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Mississippi is highly proper. He misapprehends my attitude, however, if he thinks that I do not fully understand the importance of the States retaining absolute control over their own highways, without any interference by the Federal Government. That is one of the features of this bill that commends it very strongly to me. But, Mr. President, this is the basic fact with reference to the expenditure of that money under the bill which we are now considering, or under the bill of the Senator from Mississippi, or under any of these measures, that unless the Federal Government does enter the State and does do the work, a thing which we, at least the Senator from Mississippi and I would not consent to, and I am sure our associates on this side of the Chamber would not, then the expenditure of that money must be left to the local authorities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree absolutely with the Senator about that, nor have I directed any criticism on that ground.

Mr. REED. I understand that. The laws of the State must govern and the State through such agencies as it may create will build its own roads and use this money. Therefore it is no argument against this bill that this money might be wasted by a local authority, because that would be true of any other bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And it can be prevented from going on by stopping it.

Mr. REED. It is entirely proper, if any State should misuse this money, to add such a provision as there was in the House bill introduced by the Senator, that the money should not thereafter be paid.

Mr. President, these interruptions have led me to take up more time than I had intended to take. I have simply this to say in conclusion. I am not willing that this important legislation should be laid aside to take further advice from the Commissioner of Roads of the United States. My experience with heads of departments is that when you get through with all the learning and wisdom they can bring to your aid you know less about the proposition than you would if you had started

out on your own motion to collect the facts. I do not belong to that class of men who think that the appointment of a man to an office with a high-sounding title confers wisdom upon him. I believe that the Congressmen called in from all parts of the United States and knowing their local communities, and the wants of those communities, the kind and character of soil, and the topography of their States, know as much about what is necessary as some one man selected by the Government can possibly know. I say again when that man comes in and tells me that it will take a thousand dollars a mile to maintain a rock road that under the figures just read by my friend from South Carolina only cost \$4,000 a mile, it seems to me we had better have a committee of Congress appointed to instruct the Commissioner of Roads rather than have him attempt to instruct Congress.

Now, let us see what can be accomplished by this bill, what its effect will be. The money provided will not build these roads. Nobody claims that. What will the bill do? It will be a notice to every community, every township, every road district in the United States, that if they will bring their roads up to a little better standard and put a little more work on them than they are now doing they will get this premium. It will stimulate their energies, it will arouse their ambition; it will in the end be returned a thousand fold.

Take a sand and dirt road, such as has been described here, that costs only \$400 or \$500 a mile to construct. Fifteen dollars a mile will, in all human probability, go a long distance toward keeping that road in repair. As suggested to me by the Senator from South Carolina, it would pay half of the interest on the bonds. I am not familiar with that kind of road, because we do not have many of them in my State, but I am familiar with the dirt road that is kept up to a high standard by dragging and by ditching, and \$150 a year will, in my opinion, pay for the dragging of 10 miles of that kind of road. If it will not entirely pay for it, it will pay a large per cent of it.

Thus the incentive will constantly be kept before every community of the United States to improve its roads. That means an added interest, an interest that is nation wide. It means arousing the ambition from one end of the country to the other. When once started, the movement for good roads will go on. Soon people will not be satisfied to live upon a road that is not reasonably passable. When once gravel or shell roads have been constructed in a portion of the community, they will surely be extended, until in the end, in many years, perhaps, still in a short space of time measured by the great achievement that lies before us, we will have throughout this country a network of roads that will reach every hamlet and village and almost every farm; all roads will be passable, and many of them will be beautiful and splendid highways.

Mr. President, one advantage of this plan is that the money will not be expended in one spot. It will not be used up to build one great automobile thoroughfare. It will not be put at some portion of a county or State that is remote from the great body of the population as one road must necessarily be, but it will reach into every community and it will stimulate the ambition of every portion of the people.

I do not say it is a perfect plan; I do not claim that it can not be improved upon; but I do say that it seems to me to be a working plan, a fair way to start, and that when we have once started upon this great scheme it will develop and prove an immense benefit to this country. I said awhile ago, in effect, and I repeat now, the blessings will flow to all parts of the country. If there is one thing to-day against which our people cry it is the enormous cost of living. One element of that cost is the farm products. The man who examines the statistics of this country will find that while our city population is mounting with wonderful rapidity there has been an actual decline in the rural population of some of the best agricultural States. That is, in part, because boys and girls reared upon the farm are not willing to stay where they have no decent means of reaching the city, and hence are denied all the pleasures of town life. If you will give the people of this country good roads, telephone connections, the service of interurban cars, you will soon find that the population will flow back to the country. The cost of transporting goods to the market will be cheaper. So in the end every citizen of the city, as well as every inhabitant of the country, will get his share of benefit.

We have been doing a great deal in this country for railroads. We have been granting franchises of inestimable value to great corporations that operate in the cities. I am making no complaint of that at this time. We have been so regulating the charges for carriage that the great cities are built up at the expense of the small country village, and as its commercial life blood is drained the country suffers correspondingly.

And now it is asked that we confer a small portion of the benefits of government upon the farmers of the United States,

that great class of men who in the sweat of their brows and the labor of their hands have laid the foundations of our national greatness. We should deal with them justly and generously.

I favor the provision of the House bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, we have been in session a very long time to-day, and have now been in session something over two hours to-night. There are Senators here who are anxious to be heard upon this proposition. Those of us who are in favor of the House provision are deeply in earnest about it. There has been an effort to laugh out of court, so to speak, the provision in the House bill. We believe that the more thoroughly that provision is discussed the more it will impress itself upon the Senate. We desire full and ample time for its discussion.

I trust, as anxious as the Senator from Oregon is to get his bill to a final vote and anxious as he is to get a vote upon this proposition, he will not press to an early conclusion this debate. I hope he will consent that every Senator shall have ample time to present his views on this question. As I said, we are in earnest about it. There are more people in the United States I believe interested in this proposition than in any other matter pending before this session of Congress.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, replying to the Senator from North Carolina, I desire to state that I have no wish or intention to shut off debate in the consideration of this subject. I am anxious to get the bill to passage as rapidly as possible, but not to stifle debate in any way.

I realize that we have had a long session to-day. I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina if he has any idea of the length of time that will be required, from his knowledge of the situation and of the number of Senators expected to speak upon the bill, for the further consideration of this particular item?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I think we could finish this discussion to-morrow unless more time than we expect is taken in connection with the impeachment trial. I do not feel that we ought to consent to any limitation of debate upon this matter. I think it is too important. I believe we ought to discuss it so long as anyone wishes to speak upon it.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. SWANSON. I suggest to the Senator from Oregon that we have an understanding that we will take up this provision to-morrow when the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill, and that it be understood that we will continue the discussion of the provision until it is disposed of.

Mr. SIMMONS. That will be satisfactory to me. I simply meant that I do not desire any limitation to be placed on the debate.

Mr. BOURNE. I assume that course will be agreeable.

Mr. PENROSE. Would the Senator from North Carolina object to a unanimous-consent agreement fixing a time to vote on this provision, say, to-morrow at a quarter before 2 o'clock?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not think we can agree upon an hour to-morrow, because we can not tell how much of our time to-morrow will be taken up with the impeachment trial.

Mr. SWANSON. I would not consent at this time to such an arrangement, for the simple reason that there are other provisions in the bill. I think to-morrow possibly we can reach a conclusion and take a vote on this provision. It must be remembered that we are now proceeding as in Committee of the Whole, and if any agreement should be reached now and the debate had not been completed, if everyone had not spoken who desired to speak, it would simply be continued when the bill was reported to the Senate. I think we had as well dispose of the amendment now as to have it thrashed out twice.

Mr. BOURNE. Then, Mr. President, I wish to announce that I shall ask unanimous consent, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business to-morrow, to resume the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill.

I now move that the Senate—

Mr. SWANSON. Pending the motion, I wish to make a little correction, if the Senator from Oregon will yield to me for just one minute.

Mr. BOURNE. Very well.

Mr. SWANSON. In making some estimates, while the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] had the floor, as to the amount some States would receive, they were made hurriedly by myself. I have had them made by some one else who is much more accurate at figures than myself. The estimate made is that Iowa would receive \$911,025, Mississippi would receive \$338,415, and

New York would receive \$763,350. That is the estimate made by a very accurate person, who can figure much better than I can on these matters.

I also wish to say in addition—

Mr. BAILEY. Would the Senator from Virginia, having told us how much the States would receive, be good enough to tell us just how much they would pay?

Mr. SWANSON. It is impossible to determine how much they would pay.

Mr. BAILEY. It is a poor partnership that enables us to say how much we are going to take out without also enabling us to say how much we are going to put in.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator has not followed that course himself in the appropriations made for Texas. I do not think that he has estimated how much the United States would pay for river and harbor improvements in Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not want to have the Virginia rule applied to Texas.

Mr. SWANSON. The State would be much improved if the Virginia rule was applied to Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. Texas will be the judge of that.

Mr. SWANSON. She has been the judge, and so will Virginia be. The best part of Texas is made up of Virginians.

Mr. BAILEY. As soon as we get a Virginian down there we make a Texan out of him, and he never goes back to Virginia except on a visit.

Mr. SWANSON. We have had a number who have come to Virginia from Texas and they have always remained in Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Having been born in Virginia they had sense enough to leave it.

Mr. SWANSON. They seem to be glad to get back to Virginia. I do not think, even in humor and in good nature, the Senator felt what he said about Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. No; Mr. President, I do not. I cherish a great reverence for that ancient Commonwealth, for all her people, and for none of them more than for the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. I wish to heartily reciprocate the compliment just bestowed by the Senator from Texas.

Now, Mr. President, there is another statement I wish to make so that we can be considering it. When I spoke this afternoon and said the bill prorated the amount of money according to the condition of the roads for the year, I had an idea it was for the entire year before anything could be received. One of the Members of the House who aided in preparing the bill, who is one of the best lawyers I know, and an able judge, has a contrary opinion. On his statement presented to me I have reached the conclusion he did, that it would be prorated according to the month, or time the roads were kept in good condition during the year.

As that seems to be ambiguous, I think an amendment should be made that would make the policy one way or the other clear and distinct. This provision of the House is before the Senate for amendment for improvement, for perfection, and I should like to have those gentlemen who antagonize it one way or the other offer an amendment to carry out their views in this respect. I think it prorates it, and I think the language is sufficiently clear for that purpose.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] differs from the Senator from Virginia. I hope the Senator will prepare an amendment to make that clear.

Mr. PENROSE. I hope the Senator from Oregon will withhold his motion to adjourn.

Mr. BOURNE. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. PENROSE. At the request of several Senators who desire to have nominations acted on to-night, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, August 3, 1912, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 2, 1912.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Arthur J. Tuttle, of Michigan, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Alexis C. Angell, resigned.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Clyde I. Webster, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Arthur J. Tuttle, nominated to be United States district judge.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Thomas B. Murphy, of Minot, N. Dak., to be register of the land office at Williston, N. Dak., vice Samuel Adams, deceased.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Joe Ray McCleskey to be postmaster at Boaz, Ala., in place of Joseph D. McCleskey, resigned.

IDAHO.

Walter E. Hood to be postmaster at Elk River, Idaho. Office became presidential July 1, 1912.

ILLINOIS.

Frank C. Eckard to be postmaster at Vandalla, Ill., in place of Frank C. Eckard. Incumbent's commission expired June 28, 1910.

MISSOURI.

John T. Farmer to be postmaster at Atlanta, Mo., in place of John T. Farmer. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1912.

NEBRASKA.

John F. Brechbuhl to be postmaster at Anselmo, Nebr. Office became presidential January 1, 1912.

Fred H. Whitmore to be postmaster at Valley, Nebr., in place of Mons Johnson, resigned.

OHIO.

John S. Ellen to be postmaster at Willoughby, Ohio, in place of John S. Ellen. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1912.

WEST VIRGINIA.

J. D. Hewett to be postmaster at Bramwell, W. Va., in place of William H. Hamilton, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 2, 1912.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Lewis C. Laylin to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.
SPECIAL EXAMINER OF DRUGS, MEDICINES, AND CHEMICALS, ETC.
William H. Parker, of Massachusetts, to be special examiner of drugs, medicines, and chemicals, and assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

To be second lieutenants.

CAVALRY ARM.

Corpl. Roy Oscar Henry.
Pvt. William Earle Dorman.
Corpl. John Coleman Prince.
First Sergt. Lindsley Dykeman Beach.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Corpl. John Dilworth von Holtzendorff.

INFANTRY ARM.

Sergt. Ralph Samuel Kimball.
Corpl. Francis Bernard Mallon.
Sergt. Lathrop Boyd Clapham.
Pvt. Carl James Adler.
Corpl. Otto Godfrey Pitz.
Corpl. Theophilus Steele.
Q. M. Sergt. Burton Young Read.
Corpl. George Hubert Gardiner.
Corpl. Dabney Carter Rose.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

Montgomery Herman Biggs.
Samuel Jayne Fort.
Melvin Marcus Franklin.
Marvin Whitfield Glasgow.
Rufus Hansom Hagood, jr.
Charles Herbert Parkes.
Marshall Carleton Pease, jr.
William Webster Root.
Joshua Edwin Sweet.
Frank Cary.
Edward Wright Peet.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Ensign Ralph D. Weyerbacher to be an assistant naval constructor.

Ensign Thomas B. Richey to be an assistant naval constructor.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders:

Joel R. P. Pringle,
Charles J. Lang, and
Martin E. Trench.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders:

John D. Wainwright,
Harry K. Cage,
Charles S. Freeman,
Robert L. Berry, and
Ward K. Wortman.

Passed Asst. Paymaster James F. Kutz to be a paymaster.

POSTMASTER.

ALASKA.

Augustus E. Kindell, Skagway.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, August 2, 1912.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Rev. William Couden, of Norwalk, Ohio, as follows:

Again, O God, Thou layest upon us the solemn trust of a day. How fair it drops upon us from Thy hand! We pray that Thou wilt comfort us with the sense of Thine all-searching presence and never-failing strength. Illumine our minds and hearts and wills with the light that radiates through Thy Son, our Savior Jesus Christ. Make us faithful to our Nation, our homes, our friends, our fellow men, and our own manhood, and enable us to put back into Thine eternal keeping these hours of service, all untarnished by sin. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REPORTS ON INVESTIGATION OF STEEL TRUST.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the committee to investigate violations of the act of 1890, and other acts, I desire to submit the following report (H. Rept. 1127).

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky sends up a report from the committee to investigate the Steel Trust. It is ordered printed and put on the calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have the usual time of five days in which to file the minority views.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks that the minority may have five days in which to file their views. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I send up a supplemental report of my own from the minority.

The SPEAKER. Is this the minority report?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. It is one of the minority reports.

Mr. MANN. It is one of the minority reports.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not have any official information that there were more than one. It is ordered printed and put on the calendar.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present my separate views on the steel investigation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois sends up his views, which are ordered printed and put on the calendar. The Chair will suggest to whoever has charge of these things that these reports ought to be printed together. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Michigan if this is all of them?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. No, Mr. Speaker; Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts will present a report which is agreed on by three members, at least, of the committee; but he does not seem to be in his seat this morning.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether that report is likely to be presented to-day?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. It is ready now.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that, when presented, all the reports be printed together.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Might it not be just as well to leave that matter open until Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts is present, which will be during the day?

The SPEAKER. Very well, then.

Subsequently,

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I present a report containing the views of the minority of the special com-

mittee elected to investigate the United States Steel Corporation, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a document separate from the main report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURLEY). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] submits a minority report of the committee on the investigation of the Steel Trust and asks that it be printed as a separate document. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. (H. Rept. 1127, pt. 2.)

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 15509. An act to authorize the construction and maintenance of a sewer pipe upon and across the Fort Rodman Military Reservation at New Bedford, Mass.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 25069) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. CULBERSON as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT, MILITARY ACADEMY BILL.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 24450, the Military Academy appropriation bill, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read instead of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia calls up the conference report on the Military Academy bill and asks that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 24450) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1122).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 24450) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 11 of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, after the word "hereafter," strike out the word "graduates" and insert in lieu the words "a graduate"; in line 13, after the word "from," strike out the words "West Point, N. Y.," and insert in lieu the words "his home"; in line 14, after the word "which," strike out the words "they first join" and insert in lieu the words "he first joins"; and in line 14, beginning after the word "duty," strike out all the rest of the amendment down to and including the word "strength," in line 28; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, after the word "sergeant," strike out the word "six" and insert in lieu the word "eight"; in line 4, after the word "sergeants," strike out the word "eight" and insert in lieu the word "ten"; in line 4, after the word "musicians," strike out the word "forty" and insert in lieu the words "thirty-eight"; and in line 5, after the word "and," strike out the word "forty" and insert in lieu the words "thirty-eight"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES HAY,
JAMES L. SLAYDEN,
GEO. W. PRINCE,

Managers on the part of the House.

H. A. DU PONT,
F. E. WARREN,
JOS. F. JOHNSTON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement was read, as follows:

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H. R. 24450 submit the following statement:

Amendment No. 1 provides for the appointment of two cadets from the District Columbia and for mileage to graduates of West Point when ordered to their stations; it also provides for a new method of appointment of cadets to West Point. The House agreed to the first two provisions of the amendment and refused to agree to the last provision and receded with an amendment.

Amendment No. 2 provides for two assistant professors in the department of English and history, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 3 makes a verbal correction, and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5 provide that the engineer detachment now at West Point shall remain there permanently, and the House recedes with an amendment increasing the sergeants and corporals by four and cutting off four privates.

Amendment No. 6 dispenses with the name of the typewriter authorized, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 7 makes a verbal change, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 8 gives to the Secretary of War the authority to grant leave of absence to the Superintendent of the Military Academy, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 10 struck out the House provision for the relief of Lieut. Col. J. M. Carson, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 11 provides for the promotion of Col. Wilcox, a professor at the academy, and the House recedes.

JAMES HAY,
JAMES L. SLAYDEN,
GEO. W. PRINCE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was adopted.

RIGHT FOR ELECTRIC RAILROAD, ETC., ACROSS VANCOUVER MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill 4663 and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia calls up the conference report, which the Clerk will read, and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4663) granting to the Washington-Oregon Corporation the right for an electric railroad and for telephone, telegraph, and electric transmission lines across the Vancouver Military Reservation in the State of Washington.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1072).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4663) granting to the Washington-Oregon Corporation a right of way for an electric railroad, and for telephone, telegraph, and electric-transmission lines across the Vancouver Military Reservation, in the State of Washington, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 3.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1 and 2, and agree to the same.

JAMES HAY,
S. H. DENT, JR.,
JULIUS KAHN,

Managers on the part of the House.

H. A. DU PONT,
F. E. WARREN,
JOS. F. JOHNSTON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement was read, as follows:

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House make the following statement with regard to the action of the conferees on S. 4663:

The amendments of the House Nos. 1 and 2 struck out of the Senate bill the words "the right" and the word "grant" and inserted the word "license," and the Senate receded.

The House inserted the words "at the discretion of the Secretary of War" in place of the words "during the pleasure of Congress," and the House recedes.

JAMES HAY,
S. H. DENT, JR.,
JULIUS KAHN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report. The question was taken, and the report was adopted.

IRON AND STEEL SCHEDULE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to return the papers on the bill amending the iron and steel schedule to the House, reporting a disagreement on the part of the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 18642. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] reports a disagreement on the part of the conferees on the bill H. R. 18642.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to take the steel bill (H. R. 18642) from the Speaker's table and further insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 3 and 4. Senate amendment No. 3 is an amendment repealing the Canadian reciprocity pact and Senate amendment No. 4 is merely a technical amendment renumbering the bill.

The SPEAKER. What is the number of the amendments?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Senate amendments Nos. 3 and 4. Senate amendments Nos. 1 and 2 have already been agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Are these two amendments the only ones pending?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The only ones pending.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 18642, and to further insist on the disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 3 and 4.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. I do not know as I have any objection to the action proposed to be taken, but is not this a conference report that, under the rules, would have to be printed in the *RECORD*? The bill is not on the Speaker's table.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is there now, because I returned it there.

Mr. MANN. That action does not return it to the Speaker's table. It is in the custody of the House and not of the Speaker.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not agree to that. The proper place for it is to go to the Speaker's table, and there is no conference report in the matter. The gentleman would be accurate if there was a conference report to be acted upon. But it is the custom and precedent of the House when the total disagreement is reported that there is no action required by the House. We therefore have no conference report to act upon, and the reading of the rule clearly establishes the fact that the purpose of the report and statement is to indicate to the House the points at issue between the conferees. The report made does not require action by the House. I do not desire to call up any report. I merely move to take from the Speaker's table the bill, and I think, Mr. Speaker, my motion is clearly in order and I insist upon it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Illinois, when this comes back here in this shape, is it or is it not in the exact position it was when it was first taken from the Speaker's table?

Mr. MANN. If the bill had come from the Senate it would go to the Speaker's table for reference to a committee. The bill has been to the committee and is not on the Speaker's table now. It is a conference report reported back from the committee and is in possession of the House, and like any other bill that is in the possession of the House is in the hands of the Clerk. I wish the gentleman would not precipitate a question of that kind. He could get what he wants by unanimous consent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I am going to insist on the motion because I think I am correct. But if the gentleman does not want the question raised—and I think I have a right to raise the question—I am perfectly willing, if the gentleman does not want any precedent made, to ask unanimous consent to consider the iron and steel bill. The only reason I want to take it up at this time is that it will facilitate adjournment.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to taking it up. If the gentleman's contention is correct, when a conference report on the naval bill, for instance, is submitted to the House, the conference report under the rule could not be acted upon, but the

amendments could be acted on. The purpose of the rule is to have the conference report printed for a day in the Record so that the House may have notice of what the agreement or disagreement is.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest that in this case there is no report.

Mr. MANN. Oh, there is a conference report.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No report to be acted upon.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I say there is a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Have the two gentlemen come to an agreement about what they are going to do?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would rather not take up the time of the Chair if unanimous consent is given, but otherwise I would like to argue the point of order with the Chair. But first I will ask unanimous consent that I may present the iron and steel bill to the House for the purpose of moving to disagree to Senate amendments numbered 3 and 4.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent to present to the House the iron and steel bill for the purpose of disagreeing to Senate amendments numbered 3 and 4. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to disagree to Senate amendments numbered 3 and 4. I do not desire to discuss the question, but if gentlemen on that side do desire to discuss it I will not object.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to enter a motion to concur in the amendments regarding the reciprocity pact.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] moves to concur in Senate amendments numbered 3 and 4.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to ask the gentleman from New York if he desires any time?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to concur in Senate amendments numbered 3 and 4.

The question was taken, and the motion to concur was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, a negative on the motion to concur carries a motion to nonconcur.

The SPEAKER. Yes; that carries the other proposition with it.

On motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. DOUGHTON, for 10 days, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. WILSON of New York, for 10 days, on account of illness.

DUTIES ON MANUFACTURES OF COTTON.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 25034) to reduce the duties on manufactures of cotton.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 25034—the cotton bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, pending that motion, I would like to see if I can reach an agreement with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] as to the time of general debate.

Mr. PAYNE. I would say to the gentleman that I do not know much about it. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] wants some time.

Mr. HILL. Yes; I would like some time, Mr. Speaker, and I understand that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] desires time, and one gentleman from Iowa, Judge GREEN, also desires time. I think altogether four or five hours would be required.

Mr. PAYNE. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. HILL. I should like to have an hour and a half if I can have it.

Mr. MANN. And I would like to have half an hour.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I can not agree to that length of time. I am willing to agree to three hours' general debate on the bill, but I can not agree to a longer time than that.

Mr. PAYNE. I will say to the gentleman that this side is asking for about four hours.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from New York that this bill is the identical bill that was discussed for over two weeks in the House, and there is no change in it, and it is necessary to pass it in order to reach an adjournment.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman refers to the debate that was had a year ago?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. And before the report of the Tariff Board came in on the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to agree to three hours' general debate, and I think possibly I can yield some of my time to gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. HILL. Make it five hours.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not agree to more than three hours—an hour and a half on a side. I will endeavor to yield half an hour of that to gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. LENROOT. My views not coinciding exactly with those of either the majority or minority of the committee, I dislike to ask time at the hands of either of them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Three hours of debate will allow three speeches, and if it is agreed to, I will be willing to give half an hour of my time to any gentleman that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] desires me to yield it to.

Mr. MANN. I would like to have half an hour myself.

Mr. HILL. I would like to appeal to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means on the ground that under the rule each member of the committee is entitled by virtue of his membership to an hour.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know of any rule of that kind. I may suggest that the gentleman has brought a new rule into this House at this time. If Congress is to adjourn at an early day, I think it is important that this bill be passed to-day. I should like to see if I can come to some agreement with gentlemen on that side about the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule. I understand you have a substitute. If you have, and are willing to take that substitute instead of amendments under the five-minute rule, I am willing to have a greater latitude in general debate.

Mr. PAYNE. As far as I am concerned, there is no disposition to try to make single amendments to the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. If I can get the time in general debate, I will not take any time under the five-minute rule. If I can not, I shall have to take it under the five-minute rule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly; but I want to make a reasonable agreement with gentlemen on that side, so that we can dispose of the bill to-day.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think it is reasonable to insist—

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest to the gentleman that we have five hours' general debate and no debate under the five-minute rule. If any amendments are offered, I do not suppose we can cut them off, but they can be decided without debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman wants five hours' general debate—

Mr. PAYNE. I should like three hours of it on this side. I do not want over 5 minutes myself, or 10 at the outside.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman is enlarging his demand for time on that side. Five hours' general debate means two hours and a half on a side.

Mr. PAYNE. For myself I do not want more than 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] desires an hour and a half, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] desires an hour. I desire half an hour, which I think is a very modest request. I do not think, on a great bill like this, the gentleman should insist on cutting off reasonable debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], under the rules of the House, would be entitled to only an hour. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] would be entitled to an hour. The gentleman from Illinois says he only wants half an hour.

Mr. MANN. I would be entitled to an hour. I only want half an hour for myself. I want to yield the other half hour to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We are trying to reach an agreement, and I hope the gentleman will be reasonable about it. If we can reach an agreement for four hours' general debate, two hours and a half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and an hour and a half to be controlled by myself, and that the gentlemen on that side of the House shall be entitled to offer a substitute, and the previous question be ordered and the bill voted on, I will ask unanimous consent for that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole; that there be four hours' general debate, two and one-half hours of it to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], one and one-half hours to be controlled by myself; that at the end of that time the previous question shall be ordered, with the understanding that gentlemen on that side of the House may offer a substitute, and that then the vote shall be taken.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the gentleman that if he would make it half an hour more on this side I think we could reach an agreement, although that will discommodate some gentlemen who are very anxious to talk on the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, with the understanding that we are not to have any five-minute debate, four hours and a half will carry it to 5 o'clock, and I will yield to the gentleman's wishes.

The SPEAKER. How much time does each side get? The Chair wants to know how to apportion the time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole; that there shall be four hours and one-half general debate, three hours to be controlled by the gentleman from New York, one hour and a half by myself, and that at the end of that time the gentlemen on that side of the House may have the privilege of offering a substitute, and that then the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the substitute, and the bill to its final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that general debate shall continue not more than four and a half hours; that three hours of that time shall be controlled by the gentleman from New York and an hour and a half by himself; that at the end of the four hours and a half the previous question shall be considered as ordered, and the gentleman from New York shall have the privilege of offering a substitute; and that the previous question shall be ordered, both on the bill and the substitute.

Mr. LENROOT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that if there is any Member on this side who desires to offer an amendment I shall object, but I do not desire to offer any.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There can be no objection to cutting off consideration under the five-minute rule.

Mr. LENROOT. No; and I shall not object if any Member does not wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. I do not object, Mr. Speaker, simply because, under the statement of the gentleman from Alabama, with the majority of the House behind him, determined to cut off debate on the bill, we can accomplish nothing by it, although I think it is a very autocratic proposition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from New York to consume the greater portion of his time because the time used on this side will probably all be used in answering the arguments. I made a statement yesterday in reference to the bill, and I have no further statement to make at this time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 50 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, when the Democratic cotton bill was reported in the Ways and Means Committee—

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman from Connecticut will pardon me, I understand that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] would like to address the House now, and if the gentleman from Connecticut will yield back his time I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HILL. I am perfectly willing.

Mr. PAYNE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I propose to make brief reference to the legislative history of our country for the last half century. That history may be divided into three distinctive periods.

The first, consisting of 14 years, extended from March 4, 1861, to March 4, 1875, during which time, with the exception of President Johnson, the Republicans were in control of the Government, including the House of Representatives. That period was alive with great questions and filled with the legislative solution of progressive policies of tremendous importance. The Civil War was carried on and ended. Slavery was abolished. The Union was preserved. A tremendous army was disbanded and returned to peaceful pursuits. The homestead law was passed. The Department of Agriculture was created. Agricultural and industrial colleges were provided for by national aid. Alaska was acquired. The return of specie payments was provided for. The connection of the far east and the far west by transcontinental railroads was inaugurated and the development of the great West commenced. The system of building up American industries by the aid of a protective tariff was determined upon and carried into effect.

In spite of the tremendous loss by war, the development of the country was marvelous beyond prior conception.

The second period extends from March 4, 1875, to March 4, 1897—22 years. During that time the Democrats had control

of the House of Representatives all of the time, with the exception of three two-year terms. From March 4, 1881, to March 4, 1883, from March 4, 1889, to March 4, 1891, and from March 4, 1895, to March 4, 1897, the House was Republican, but during the rest of the 22 years the House was Democratic.

The third period extends from March 4, 1897, to March 4, 1911—14 years—during which time the Republicans were in control both in the House and in the presidential office.

During these 14 years the gold financial standard was firmly established; Cuba was freed; Hawaii, Porto Rico, and other insular possessions acquired; the Department of Commerce and Labor was created; the Agricultural Department was developed and expanded; the regulation of railroads and interstate commerce was vitalized; the irrigation of arid lands by national aid was provided for; the difficulties surrounding an isthmian canal were removed, and the construction of the Panama Canal was authorized and commenced; the Navy was enlarged and really recreated; the pure-food law was enacted; white slavery was attacked by national legislation; a drastic meat-inspection law was passed; the daily hours of labor on railroads was restricted; the use of many safety appliances on railroads was required; a general policy of national forests was started; conservation of natural resources was made a dominant issue; water-power sites and coal and other mineral lands reserved from exploitation; the construction of dams and bridges over navigable waters was regulated by law; rural free delivery of mail was provided for; an income-tax amendment was submitted to the States, and such an impetus was given to industrial development that the growth and expansion of material prosperity during those 14 years has never been equaled or approached in any other period of the world's history. [Applause.]

Take, for example, what was accomplished in one 10-year period.

From the year 1900 to 1910, while the population of our country increased from 76,000,000 to 92,000,000, the national wealth increased from \$88,000,000,000 to \$137,000,000,000.

The savings deposits increased from \$2,389,000,000 to \$4,070,000,000.

The postal receipts increased from \$102,000,000 to \$224,000,000.

The expenditures for public schools increased from \$200,000,000 to \$401,000,000.

The number of depositors in savings banks increased from 6,107,000 to 9,142,000.

The capital invested in manufactures increased from \$8,978,000,000 to \$18,237,000,000, the wages and salaries paid in manufactures increased from \$2,390,000,000 to \$4,353,000,000, and the products of manufactures increased from \$11,411,000,000 to \$20,092,000,000, these figures not including neighborhood industries or hand trades.

The materials consumed in manufactures increased from \$6,577,000,000 to \$11,675,000,000, the number of employees from 5,079,000 to 7,399,000, and the primary horsepower used increased from 10,098,000 to 19,035,000.

These are the figures of the census for the respective years 1900 and 1910, though as to manufactures they relate to the years 1899 and 1909.

During the same period, from 1900 to 1910, the value of the farm lands increased from \$13,000,000,000 to \$28,000,000,000. The value of the farm buildings from \$3,556,000,000 to \$6,294,000,000. The value of the farm implements and machinery from \$749,000,000 to \$1,261,000,000.

The exports from our country increased from \$1,370,000,000 to \$2,049,600,000, and in the year ending June 30, 1912, the manufactures exported from this country, not including food-stuffs, amounted to the enormous sum of over one thousand million dollars.

While from 1899 to 1909 the school population in the public graded and high schools increased only from 21,917,000 to 24,239,000, the expenses for public schools increased from \$200,154,000 to \$401,397,000.

In 1900 the farm value of the corn produced in the country was \$751,000,000; in 1910 it was \$1,523,000,000. The farm value of the wheat produced in 1900 was \$323,000,000; in 1910, \$621,000,000.

The farm value of oats produced in 1900 was \$208,000,000; in 1910, \$384,000,000. The farm value of cotton produced in 1900 was \$438,000,000; in 1910, \$820,000,000. The farm value of cotton seed increased from \$77,000,000 during the 10 years to \$142,000,000.

The value of horses in 1900 was \$603,000,000; in 1910, \$2,276,000,000. The value of milch cows in 1900 was \$514,000,000; in 1910, \$780,000,000. The value of sheep in 1900 was \$122,000,000; in 1910, \$233,000,000. The value of hogs in 1900 was \$185,000,000; in 1910, \$436,000,000.

The total value of farm animals in 1900 was \$2,228,000,000; in 1910, \$5,138,000,000.

The total value on the farm of farm productions in 1900 was \$5,017,000,000; in 1910, \$8,926,000,000.

The total production of coal in 1900 was 240,000,000 long tons; in 1910, 477,000,000.

The total production of pig iron in 1900 was 13,789,000 tons; in 1910, 27,298,000 tons.

The production of petroleum in 1900 was 2,672,000,000 gallons; in 1910, 8,801,000,000 gallons.

Nothing so marvelous in increase of production and prosperity was ever before known. The wise legislation put upon the statute books by the Republican Party, including the Dingley tariff law, was largely responsible. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We point with swelling pride to the policies adopted, the legislation enacted, and the achievements consummated during the two periods of Republican control; but who points with pride to things accomplished during the 16 years that the Democrats had charge of the House. Then, as now, they were engaged in seeking to break down the governmental policies which produced prosperity, were carrying on useless and expensive investigations productive of no good, and generally engaged in a program of faultfinding.

The present Democratic majority in this House has now disclosed its intentions. It has advertised its purposes. It has declared its will. It speaks for the Democratic Party through its concrete acts, and that party is bound by those acts.

The Democrats have already passed four tariff bills through this House at this session. A fifth is now proposed. They are all free-trade or tariff-for-revenue-only bills. They all abandon completely the theory of protection. The friends of the bills admit this.

Those bills all lower the rates of duties on imported articles, but contemplate increased importations to produce the revenue.

The authors of these bills insist that the tariff rates fixed in them are based solely upon the idea of producing revenue, even though such rates will not equal the difference between the actual cost of production in this country and foreign countries.

These bills, therefore, are intended to encourage importations, to give comfort and aid to foreign manufacturers, to help pay the taxes in foreign lands, to give labor to foreign workmen and help pay the wages of foreign laborers, to build up and make thriving foreign communities, to aid in the consumption of foreign raw materials, to do for foreign lands what patriotic statesmen strive to do for their own country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The metal bill would increase our importations of foreign ores, would add greatly to the quantity of manufactured metals brought to us from foreign shores, and would deliver the trade in our seacoast cities to the foreigners.

The chemical bill puts a tariff tax upon raw materials not produced here, but coming from tropical countries, while at the same time reducing the tariff on the manufactured finished products in which such raw materials are used, thus cutting off from our home manufacturer at both ends.

The sugar bill would drive out our own cane sugar, would prevent the growth of our beet-sugar industry, and injure, if not ruin, those now engaged in the production of raw sugar in this country.

The wool bill would largely destroy sheep raising by us, would make us dependent upon foreign lands for our wool in time of peace, and might make us do without in time of war. It would largely drive our woolen factories to foreign shores.

These Democratic tariff bills would add many new factories in the lands of our foreign competitors, but not one in our own country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

They would give employment to many additional people in other lands, but to no one here.

They would send our money abroad to pay the wages of foreign workmen, but would bring despair to the hearts of those seeking employment here.

They would add to wages paid abroad; they would add to idle labor here; they would add to the growth of manufacturing abroad and to the number of labor strikes here; they would add happiness to the foreign laborer and cause notices of decrease of wages to the American laborer; they would open mills over there and close mills here; they would bring a smile of contentment abroad and a wail of despair here.

That they would for a time reduce prices I do not deny. They would thereby destroy the small producer here, even if the larger trusts and combinations were able to survive.

The reduction in prices would mean cutting off the profits and cutting down the wages; would mean strikes and riots and starvation and hell for the wage earner and his family,

destruction for the manufacturer, and damnation for the home industry, to be followed by a rise in prices for the benefit of the trusts here and the foreign producers, while many of our own people would still be out of employment and without sufficient means to buy at higher or lower prices. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I quote from Genesis:

And Jacob sod pottage: and Esau came from the field, and he was faint:

And Esau said to Jacob, Feed me, I pray thee, with that same red pottage: for I am faint: therefore was his name called Edom.

And Jacob said, Sell me this day thy birthright.

And Esau said, Behold, I am at the point to die: and what profit shall this birthright do to me?

And Jacob said, Swear to me this day; and he swore unto him: and he sold his birthright unto Jacob.

Then Jacob gave Esau bread and pottage of lentiles; and he did eat and drink, and rose up, and went his way: thus Esau despised his birthright. (Verses 29 to 34, ch. XXV, Book of Genesis.)

Our birthright is the right to be industrious, the right to labor, the right to produce, the right to have, the right to earn, the right to live in comfort, the right to be happy, the right to feed and clothe and shelter our wives and our children, the right to consume what others produce, and the right to produce what others shall consume—the right to live and work on the scale of American citizenship and civilization.

The Democratic Party would trade off this birthright of the American people, this basic principle of permanent happiness and success, for the mess of pottage of temporary cheaper prices, caused by increasing importations of foreign goods. Such statesmanship would eat the seed corn instead of planting it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If Democratic victory shall become assured and Democratic policies be enacted into law, we will again walk through the valley of the shadow of death, again learn the value and troubles of painful economy, again experience the pangs of desperate hunger, again witness the desolation of idle mills and silenced machinery.

But, though temporary Democratic success may injure, it can not destroy our land.

Though the clouds of fatuous Democratic policies may gather thick and black, though despair may fill the air, though destruction may threaten farm and factory interests, miner and magnate, the permanent resources of our country will remain. The sun will still continue to shed its light and heat. The rich fertility of the soil will still be there. The rains and the dews will not stop. The wealth of minerals beneath the surface will continue to invite the enterprise and ingenuity of man and urge that they be made use of in providing the necessities, the comforts, and the luxuries of civilized life. The unused bounties of nature will not vanish.

And reason will regain its throne. Hope will revive. Men will again realize that no theories or policies of statecraft will enable them to sell what they produce at high prices and to buy what they consume at low prices; that the country at large must be prosperous and busy if individuals shall thrive; that factories and farms go hand in hand to success or to adversity; that prosperous mills and mines are dependent each upon the other; that order and stability of law, policies, and business are essential to the growth and maintenance of contented society, happy homes, work for all, and a prosperous country.

And with this realization will come a renewed faith in the Republican Party, its leaders, and its policies. [Applause on the Republican side.] Confidence will be restored in the land; the hearts of the people will swell. They will put forth renewed effort.

The enterprise, the ingenuity, the inventive genius, the honest toil of man will combine with the accumulated wealth of the past and the unbounded plenteousness of the resources of nature to again make the wheels of the machinery of industrial prosperity hum and whirl in the midst of a happy, a contented, a busy, a well-paid, and a prosperous people, represented by a Republican House and a Republican administration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Republican Party—its memories are too sacred, its principles are too righteous and too enduring, its achievements are too inspiring and too lasting, its record is too grand, its need to the country is too great, its leadership and its membership are too patriotic and too filled with hope for the country for it to be destroyed by the assaults of its enemies from without or within. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It will continue its organization and its work with renewed vitality, with continued loyalty, the possessor of a noble past and with a wonderful future of deeds to be accomplished lying before it.

It will not die. It will not cease. It will go on and on, with heroic devotion to the principles of constitutional government

and with continued faith that our right-thinking people will maintain order and preserve equality and prosperity. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL]. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURLEY). The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, when the cotton bill was considered before the Committee on Ways and Means I offered a substitute for the Democratic proposition. Since that time there has been some change in the phraseology but not in the rates of the substitute. I will ask the pages to distribute among the Members copies of the bill, which I have brought up to date, and my hope is that without many changes it may be finally offered as a substitute for the Democratic bill. I am for the improvement of this schedule. My reason for distributing the substitute now is that I wish to refer to it and the Underwood bill in the progress of the discussion.

Mr. Speaker, on August 22, 1911, the President of the United States sent to the Congress a veto of a bill identical in every respect, except the dates, with the one now under consideration.

In that message he said:

The bill would not go into effect, by its terms, until January 1 next, and before that time a full report to be submitted to Congress by the Tariff Board, based upon the most thorough investigation, will show the comparative cost of all the elements of production in the manufacture of cotton in this and other countries. The investigation by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House did not cover the facts showing this comparative cost, for the reason that the committee was preparing a bill on a tariff-for-revenue basis, and their view of a proper tariff was avowedly at variance with the theory of protection. Pledged to support a policy of moderate protection, I can not approve a measure which violates its principle.

When the reports of the Tariff Board upon these schedules are received, the duties which should be imposed can be determined upon justly and with intelligent appreciation of the effect that they will have both upon industry and upon revenue. Very likely some of the changes in this bill will prove desirable and some to be undesirable. So far as they turn out to be just and reasonable I shall be glad to approve them, but at present the proposed legislation appears to be all a matter of guesswork. The important thing is to get our tariff legislation out of the slough of guesswork and logrolling and ex parte statements of interested persons and to establish that legislation on the basis of tested and determined facts, to which shall be applied, fairly and openly, whatever tariff principle the people of the country choose to adopt.

On March 28, 1912, the President sent to Congress another message, from which I quote:

In several messages to Congress I have expressed my wish for a revision of the present tariff schedule by schedule when justified by an adequate knowledge of facts regarding each industry, as shown by an impartial and nonpartisan inquiry. In order to secure such an impartial inquiry into the facts I established, under the authority vested in me by law, a Tariff Board of five members. On December 20, 1911, I transmitted to the Congress a report of the board on Schedule K (wool and manufactures of). The board was unanimous in its findings of fact, and on the basis of these findings I recommended a revision of that schedule.

I now transmit a report of the Tariff Board on Schedule I (cotton manufactures). In this report, also, the board is unanimous in its findings. On the basis of the report I now recommend that the Congress proceed to a consideration of this schedule, with a view to its revision and a reduction of its rates.

I base this recommendation on the declaration of the platform on which I was elected—that a reasonable protective tariff should be adjusted to the difference in cost of production at home and abroad.

Reviewing the work of the board on this schedule, he closed as follows:

These matters are set forth fully in the report of the board, which presents in impartial manner the necessary facts on which an intelligent revision of this schedule can be based.

I therefore recommend that the Congress proceed to such a revision without delay.

Loyalty to a Republican administration, to the platform of my party, and to the constituency which sent me here seemed to demand that at least a thorough study of the report should be made, for the investigation had been an exhaustive one and had cost a large amount of time and money. Feeling my own unfitness for the work, I called to my assistance several of the experts who had conducted the investigation, and after many weary days of careful study a new Schedule I was constructed, which, if the report of the Tariff Board as to American costs is correct, is protective in every item and yet is in strict accord with the Republican platform as to the elimination of excessive duties, while still preserving the security against foreign competition to which American producers and wage-workers are entitled.

GUESSWORK OF TARIFF MAKING.

It is no light task to adjust the rates of a tariff schedule to the basic facts of a great industry like this. It is far easier to guess at them, as our Democratic friends have done, their only object being to guess, first, as to the amount of money needed to meet expenditures not yet incurred, and, second, to guess again as to the rates which will be most productive on importations, the amount of which must also be the subject of further guessing.

In such a task the first thought of a Republican must be the preservation and encouragement of the competing domestic industry, the maintenance of the home standard of living, and the scale of wages which a distinctively American civilization demands.

The first thought of a Democrat who honestly believes in the modern idea of a tariff for revenue only must be to encourage foreign purchases by domestic consumers and to tax the imported articles up to the point of the greatest revenue, but always below the point where the added cost will give to the home producer the chance of successful competition. It was on this basis that this Democratic cotton bill was framed, as shown by the chairman of the committee, when in response to the question of Mr. HINDS, of Maine, whether this bill "left out entirely the principle of protection," Mr. UNDERWOOD replied, "Absolutely, so far as my knowledge is concerned." The facts since ascertained and agreed to and certified in writing by the cotton manufacturers from the Northern and Southern States alike show beyond the possibility of impeachment that in some of the rates of the Democratic bill excessive, ineffective, and uselessly protective duties are found, and in others duties so low as to compel the transfer of portions of the industry to foreign countries.

It is the bud, the flower, and the full fruition of the guesswork process of tariff making, the wonder being that any of the guesses of 1911 are even partially sustained by the facts of 1912.

THE SUBSTITUTE BILL.

The bill which was offered in committee as a substitute for the Democratic cotton schedule revision is a protective measure in every item of it, as will be easily seen by examination of the report of the Tariff Board. It is based upon the bedrock foundation of American costs, and as evidence of the accuracy with which these were taken I submit the following statement of Mr. H. C. Emery, chairman of the board, written in response to my inquiry concerning the methods employed:

THE TARIFF BOARD.

Treasury Building, Washington, May 25, 1912.

Hon. EBENEZER J. HILL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HILL: Referring to your questions in conversation with Mr. Cowgill regarding the accuracy of the cost figures in our cotton report and your request that a statement be made in writing, I beg to say that in all instances where reports were obtained from cotton-manufacturing companies the results of our cost extensions were carefully examined by the officers of the mill before the report was forwarded to the Tariff Board. This examination was complete, and went into each detail of the extensions rather than merely to have the officers sign their names without making a close examination. The cost-extension figures were carefully compared with the cost extension made by the mills, and all the reports forwarded to the board were agreed by the officers of the company and representatives of the board to be correct. As to the accuracy of these extensions, I wish to state that the total expenditures of the company were carefully checked to agree with the figures published in their annual financial statement. Using these sums as a basis, we then made up our own cost statement according to our own methods, which we believe to be accurate and not merely the accepting of the company's own estimates of cost.

In one instance a company was doing an \$8,000,000 annual business; after the costs had been extended for this company and the total number of yards of each kind of goods multiplied by the cost per yard as shown by the report, the figures checked within \$8.33 of the total amount of money expended by this company in manufacture during the year for which the costs were taken. In another case, by the same method, the variation amounted to \$332. The greatest variation in any of the reports was in the case of a company doing a \$2,000,000 annual business where, by multiplying the number of yards produced by the cost per yard ascertained by us, the difference amounted to \$3,500. But this difference would not affect the costs in the sixth decimal place.

In every case the companies agreed, after a careful examination, that our costs were correct, and in some few cases the mills have adopted our cost extensions in toto, while in others our system of extensions have been adopted at least in part.

These facts I believe fully justify the statement that the most accurate costs possible have been obtained.

Very truly, yours,

HENRY C. EMERY, Chairman.

In view of that letter and the facts stated therein, any claim that the cost figures are not correct must necessarily be an impeachment not only of the experts who took them from the mill books, but of the books, the mill managers who reviewed and signed the statements, and indeed of everybody and everything except the one-year-old guesses of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is speaking of the cotton report?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HILL. I would be glad to, but I have not the time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman read Mr. McRae's analysis of the wool report?

Mr. HILL. Yes. I can not yield now. I asked for an hour and a half with the expectation of answering questions, but I could not get it.

A COTTON SCHEDULE ONLY.

As the substitute is drawn it is a cotton schedule relating to articles composed wholly or in chief value of cotton, the words "or other vegetable fiber" being stricken out of it wherever found, thus sending articles composed in chief value of linen to the linen schedule, where they naturally belong, and bringing back to the cotton schedule sundry manufactures of cotton, which have nested for years in other schedules at higher rates of duty than the facts justified. The easiest possible way to change a tariff rate without seeming to do it is by a change of classification or by cutting out specific mention of the article and letting it fall innocently into a basket clause.

In my judgment a schedule of taxation should always be so plain that he who pays may read and know how much and for what the payment is made.

AD VALOREM DUTIES.

But it is said that the rates are ad valorem. That is true, and made so intentionally. If it is wrong, then every Republican who voted for the wool bill a few days ago is wrong, and every Republican who voted for the Payne or Dingley wool schedules is wrong, for every fabric-conversion duty in all of those schedules is an ad valorem duty and the only specifics are the direct and compensatory wool duties. In the cotton schedule there is no duty on the raw material, and hence no need for compensatory specifics.

On page 18 of the wool report, the board says:

It is probably impracticable to adopt a purely specific system of duties on woven fabrics. No feasible scheme of classifying and describing fabrics in terms corresponding to differences in conversion cost has yet been worked out.

On pages 65 to 75 of the cotton report, this question is exhaustively discussed and the consensus of the argument is overwhelming in favor of ad valorem rates as against the present law system.

On page 73 the board says:

So far as the motive for undervaluation is concerned, it is more powerful under the scheme adopted in the present law than it would be under a straight ad valorem tariff.

On page 74 they say:

A system which puts a specific rate on an ad valorem basis seems to combine the evils of both systems.

As further testimony on this point, I quote from an opinion given three years ago by a member of the New York Board of Appraisers. He says:

It is respectfully urged upon the committee that lines of demarcation dependent on value as in this case should be eliminated so far as possible from the tariff act. The fact that a few cents increase in the value of commodities raises the amount of the duty levied 125 to 150 per cent, as sometimes occurs in this paragraph, is a great incentive to fraud. In such cases the unscrupulous merchant enjoys an extraordinary advantage over the scrupulous one. The incentive to undervalue is so great and the difficulty of precise ascertainment of the actual market in these goods which constantly fluctuates, render satisfactory and just administration almost impossible.

This view was also confirmed by another member of the board of appraisers a few days ago when the substitute bill was submitted to him for suggestions both as to plan and rates, in a conference of several hours' duration.

Other eminent authorities might also be cited along the same line, but it would seem to be unnecessary.

CLASSIFICATION.

It is claimed also that the substitute bill changes the present system of classification. That is true and such a change is made absolutely necessary by the surprising statements of the Tariff Board concerning the weaving and finishing branches of the industry. Three years ago reputable men represented to the committee that an increase of duty of one-fortieth of a cent per number was needed on yarns and 1 cent per yard on all cloths, because of the excess cost of mercerizing here over the cost of like processes abroad. I have not the slightest doubt but that they honestly believed that this was true. As one of the committee, I accepted it as true then, and cheerfully voted for the additional duty. But it is now proven beyond dispute that in 1911, not only was there no excess in cost here, but that, taking all finishing costs of bleaching, dyeing, printing, and mercerizing on an average of all, the American cost was only about 80 per cent of that of our English competitors. The subject is discussed on pages 496 to 518, and the tabulated comparison of the respective charges in England and the United States will be found on page 502 of the report. Even if some slight variations should be found in the accuracy of a conclusion reached by taking an average cost, the differences would be fully met by the application of the regular ad valorem to the increased value of the cloths and yarns, because of the finishing processes.

It inevitably follows, therefore, that the classification by which cotton cloths receive cumulative duties under the present law should be changed, and the same thing is much more true of the Democratic bill, in which 5 per cent additional

duty for finishing processes was provided last year and defended in the majority report. In the report of the Democratic majority this year, on page 25, they say (Rept. No. 829, 62d Cong., 2d sess.):

The conclusions, therefore, to be drawn from the board's study of the processes of finishing, including mercerizing and dyeing, is that no duty whatever is called for with respect to these processes in manufacture, and that such duty as may be imposed in that connection will be of service merely from the standpoint of revenue and might as well be discarded entirely, unless it be desired to impose a revenue duty upon goods which have been subjected to these particular processes.

In other words, they acknowledge the mistake in their classification guess of last year and now continue it under the pretense of a revenue duty, knowing full well that it is prohibitive and will not bring the revenue calculated in their last year's estimates. Would it not be far better for both sides of the House and the country if we should all manfully acknowledge that we were all mistaken in some of these things and make rates now based on the facts as the Tariff Board have given them to us?

AUTOMATIC LOOMS.

There is, however, another and far more important fact which absolutely controls the question of classification and wholly nullifies all former tariff legislation in this respect, and that is the automatic loom. I do not see how it could have been possible to have made classifications of plain woven cloths, based on fineness of yarns or number of threads to the inch, if the Congress had ever before had the knowledge which the Tariff Board has given to us with reference to this matter. It will be seen at once, by reference to pages 490 to 495 of the board report, that one of the determining factors of the difference in cost between Europe and the United States as to plain woven cotton goods is the use here of the automatic loom and the inability to use it in Europe. Take, for example, the bleached domestic No. 12 in the board's list of 100 samples, and it will be found that the number of looms tended by a single weaver on this fabric runs from 14 to 28, and that the product per hour of each weaver is from 64 to 101 yards, whereas the English weaver on the same fabric, operates 4 looms with a product of 18 yards per hour. Take the ordinary calico No. 41; the number of automatic looms tended by a single weaver in this country is 14 to 20, with a product per hour of 102 yards, whereas the English weaver tends 4 plain looms, with a product per hour of 24 yards. Take No. 76, an outing flannel; the weaver in the United States tends 12 to 20 looms, with an hourly product of from 60 to 80 yards, against the weaver of England, tending 4 plain looms, with an hourly product of 24 yards.

The summary of this statement shows that the production per weaver per hour on 29 of the 31 different kinds of cloths exemplified was very much greater in the United States than in England, reaching in some instances to five times as much, and the board states that the reason for this is the number of looms attended per weaver.

Now, when you add to this statement the fact that at the date of this report there were only between five and six thousand automatic looms in Lancashire out of a total of 741,000, and that in all Great Britain there were about 10,000 automatic looms, as against approximately 220,000 in the United States, it becomes manifest immediately that all classifications heretofore made on any other basis than that of loom production are completely nullified by this astounding fact, for the manufacture of plain woven cloth under these conditions is absolutely determined by the unit cost rather than by the wages paid to the individual.

The classification in this substitute bill, therefore, has been made first on the basis of plain woven goods in which the automatic loom is used in this country. Second, fancy woven goods produced on the plain looms with sundry mechanical attachments, where it is impossible for the weaver to attend to many of them, and hence where a much less production is secured than with automatics. As, for example, in No. 26, a checked lawn, where the report shows that on what is styled the dobby loom, the American weaver will tend from 8 to 12 machines and produce from 29 to 36 yards per hour, while the English weaver is not allowed to attend but 4 machines and produces but 14 yards per hour. This is one of a number of similar devices, but in all of them the number of looms attended and the product per hour is considerably in favor of the American weaver.

The third classification is the Jacquard loom, where the number of looms tended and the product in both countries is practically alike, and where because of this the marked difference in wages in the two countries necessitates a high protective duty.

The fourth classification is tapestries and pile fabrics, the production of which is also distinctly affected by the difference in the wage cost.

On page 11, synopsis of the report, the board say:

Where automatic looms can be used a single weaver commonly tends 20 looms, and sometimes as many as 28. The result is that whereas the output per spinner per hour in England is probably as great or greater than in this country the output per weaver per hour is, upon a large class of plain goods, less, and in the case where automatic looms are used in this country and plain looms in England it is very much less.

It is manifest, therefore, that the determining factor in classifying fabrics is the style of weaving and not the fineness of the material used or the number of threads to the inch, and I do not see how it is possible for anyone who has read the report, even in the most casual way, to come to any other conclusion.

Indeed, the merest glance at the present law will justify the change.

Distinction between plain woven and other weaves, with a demarcation of weight per yard, is found in paragraph 357 of the linen schedule. In 323 of the cotton schedule fancy weaving is used as a reason for a cumulative duty of 1 and 2 cents per yard. In the silk schedule an arbitrary ad valorem limit of duty is fixed for fabrics made on Jacquard looms, and in paragraph 326 of the present cotton schedule, as in this substitute bill, all upholstered goods weighing over 6 ounces per yard woven on Jacquard looms carry a straight ad valorem duty.

If the rule of weight and style of weave is good for the present law, why is it not equally good for the substitute?

The cold facts in the case are that the distinction between plain and fancy weaves in part provided for in paragraph 323 by cumulative duties is duplicated in the classification by values in the countable paragraphs of the present law. A like duplication was stricken out in 1909 by an amendment in committee offered by the chairman, Mr. PAYNE. It was put back again in the Senate. I have no comments to make on it now. This classification again strikes out the duplication, and it ought never to go back again.

METHODS OF COMPARISON.

In the report on the wool schedule, comparisons between this and other countries were made on the basis of the difference in the cost of production, what the board terms the difference in conversion cost. In the cotton report a different method was generally used, although in yarns and to some extent in knit goods actual costs were secured. Speaking generally, however, the method used with regard to cotton cloths was, in the first place, to secure with an accuracy which, in my judgment, has never before been equaled in this country the actual American costs of production which, as I have shown by the letter of Chairman Emery, have been agreed to and certified after completion by the manufacturers themselves over their own signatures. They go into the most minute details, and are carried from the original material straight through to the finished articles in the hands of the ultimate consumer, so far as the 100 samples are concerned, out of a total of 1,268 standard cloths analyzed and reported upon by the board. The 100 samples so selected may be construed as fairly typical of the American production of cotton fabrics. They are followed through every process of manufacture, and photographic copies of the fabrics will be found in the report. For 91 of these samples the figures are complete, and I have them tabulated as follows:

1. List of 40 samples, where the American selling price is less than the English selling price without any duty.
2. List of 26 other samples, where the American cost plus the selling expense is less than the English selling price without any duty.
3. List of 17 other samples, where the American cost plus selling expense is less than the English selling price plus the duty proposed in the substitute bill.
4. List of eight samples, where the American cost plus selling expense is more than the English selling price plus the proposed duties in the substitute bill.

Averaging the costs of the American and foreign selling prices in each table I find the following: That on the goods named in class 1 they are reported to carry an average profit of 13.2 per cent, and that even then the American selling price is 20.3 per cent less in this country than the English selling price of like goods by the English mills in England. This class consists very largely of fabrics made upon the automatic loom. Is it not perfectly manifest that the selling price of the cloths in this class is not in any way affected by the existing tariff laws, but that domestic competition alone controls them, and that the American consumer pays no increased price whatever because of the tariff?

Class 2, a higher grade of fabrics, shows an average margin between the American cost plus selling expense and the American selling price of 36.2 per cent; but it also shows that the margin between the American cost plus selling expense and the English selling price without any duty is but 16.8 per cent,

which indicates in a general way that these cloths are affected by the existing tariff law.

Class 3 shows that the margin between the American cost plus selling expense and the English selling price plus the proposed duty in the substitute bill is only 14.2 per cent, which, in a general way, indicates that it would be impossible for the American manufacturer to compete with his foreign competitor on the fabrics named in this list unless protected by duties as high as those prescribed in the substitute bill.

Class 4 is a list of exceptional cases, which, after much trouble and reinvestigation, were found in every case to furnish good and sufficient reasons why they might be considered exceptional, as, for example, where the articles compared here and abroad had differences in the texture and where in some cases the materials for the cloth manufacture had been taken from subsidiary concerns, and where one or more profits had been taken before the finished fabric was estimated upon. I am well aware that an average cost and an average selling price taken in this way only gives an indication of the general condition of an industry, and that here and there there may be an item which can not and ought not to be treated on the basis of a general average, and it has been a task of exceeding difficulty to adjust the rates in the substitute bill in such a way as to cover every case. On the face of the reports made by the Tariff Board and on the basis of the Chicago platform of 1908, no man can justify a duty of 5 per cent, which I have put on duck and unbleached sheetings, selling, as they are to-day, far below the prices which our competitors fix upon their products, but there are good and substantial reasons why every one of these products should bear a duty. In the first place, it is manifest by the report, as shown by the general summary of yarn costs, that it is not possible for the American manufacturer to make cotton yarns now as cheaply as his English competitor, and a small duty is needed in order to secure this market to our own producers. That we do have it practically now is shown by the fact that the importations are only about four tenths of 1 per cent of the domestic consumption and that exports are exceedingly small, amounting only to about \$600,000 in 1911.

The difference in the conversion cost of yarn between the United States and England will be found on page 423 of the report. In figuring the rates of duty 10 per cent was added to the English cost to make the English export selling price, and the average found for yarns below No. 40 was 5.7 per cent. The American manufacturer was given the benefit of the doubt and the rate fixed at 7½ per cent.

The average for yarns from No. 50 to No. 70, inclusive, is shown to be 8½ per cent, and the rate fixed in the substitute bill is made 10 per cent.

Exceeding No. 80 the rate is fixed at 15 per cent.

These duties are in excess of the present difference in the cost of their production.

With this excess of duty fixed upon yarns it is only fair to the smaller manufacturers of this country, who buy their yarns and weave and finish only, that an equivalent or compensatory duty should be placed upon the cloth, and this alone would justify a small duty on the heavier and coarser products which are covered by the classification of not more than 5 square yards to the pound.

In the second place the selling prices on the goods named in all of these classes were taken in 1911, when the cotton industry was laboring under a marked depression, as is shown by the fact that the three calicoes named in class 1 were sold at about 10 per cent less than cost.

A third reason why a duty should be placed upon these products is the uncertainty of trade-union conditions both in this country and in England. Here no restriction is placed by the trade-unions on the number of automatic looms which a weaver may tend. In England the limit is four, but as American competition on many of these products becomes sharper and sharper in Canada, China, and other neutral territory, it is by no means impossible that these restrictions may be removed. That a material difference, however, will always exist in this respect can be inferred from the following quotation from page 494 of the Tariff Board report:

The automatic loom costs about two and one-half times the ordinary plain loom, and this has deterred many English mills already equipped with plain looms from adopting them. Again, English mills do not run such a large number of looms on a single-standard fabric as do American mills, and the automatic loom has not been found so suitable as plain looms for the varied Lancashire trade in dhories and other fancies. Furthermore, the automatic loom requires stronger and better warp yarn than the plain loom, for the breakage of a single warp thread stops the loom. The American mills use strong ring-spun warp yarns, while a large portion of the English mills, producing mainly for the poorer classes of the Orient and other regions, have to size heavily to make goods cheap enough, and they ordinarily use a much lower grade of yarn than would American mills for fabrics that pass under the same trade name. The warp yarns used in the bulk of English cloths are mule spun, and since they are soft twisted to enable them to take

up a larger amount of sizing and to give the required feel to the cloth, they are not so suited to the automatic loom as are the stronger American yarns.

A fourth reason why a duty should be placed upon them is that already, since these figures of costs and selling prices were taken, there has been a general advance in wages in the cotton industry throughout the United States of about 15 per cent, which of itself would be equivalent to an increase of cost of about 5 per cent on the finished fabric.

A fifth and last reason is Japanese competition. Personally I do not think it is serious at the present time because of the low grade of the product of the Japanese mills, due to their inexperience in the use of machinery and the inferior character of much of the material used. Japanese competition, however, as I know from personal observation, is a cloud on our western horizon which it is well worth our while to watch.

I desire now to call your attention to the rates in the Underwood bill, now pending before the House.

Since the substitute bill which I offered in the Ways and Means Committee was voted down and the Democratic bill was reported out favorably, the two great national parties have made new tariff declarations. Are these bills in accord with them? Let us go right to the foundation of the industry as shown by the difference in cost of production of yarns between England and the United States, found on page 423 of the Tariff Board report. I will insert a table showing the difference in cost on each of three warp yarns and five filling yarns there given and the duties under the present law, the Underwood, and substitute bills;

Yarn duties compared per pound.

Yarn number.	American cost.	English cost.	Difference.	Present law duty.	Underwood duty.	Substitute bill duty.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
No. 30 warp.....	25.12	22.99	2.13	0.05	2.52	1.89
No. 40 warp.....	32.71	29.62	3.09	.08	3.25	2.44
No. 50 warp.....	35.90	31.63	3.27	.10	3.47	3.47
No. 30 filling.....	24.25	22.97	1.28	.05	2.52	1.89
No. 40 filling.....	31.53	29.52	2.01	.08	3.24	2.43
No. 50 filling.....	34.28	31.46	2.82	.10	3.46	3.46
No. 60 filling.....	37.93	34.54	3.39	.12	5.69	3.79
No. 70 filling.....	41.31	37.14	4.17	.14	6.11	4.08
Total.....			22.16	.72	30.26	23.45
Average.....			2.77	.09	3.78	2.93

NOTE.—Duties figured on 10 per cent additional to English mill cost. Underwood duties average 36 per cent in excess of difference in cost. Substitute bill duties average 5 per cent in excess of difference in cost. Present law duties average 225 per cent in excess of difference in cost.

It appears that all show an average excess over and above the entire difference in cost in the present law by 225 per cent, in the substitute bill by 5 per cent, and in the Underwood so-called revenue bill by 36 per cent.

Mr. KITCHIN. Right there, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. HILL. I can not yield. I have not the time.

Now, I do not care whether these yarns are the staple product of the East or the West, the North or the South, but what I do claim is that the Underwood bill covers in its yarn duties the entire difference in cost of production, including conversion cost and raw material as well, on every one of these items by an excess of from 5 per cent to 97 per cent, and averaging 36 per cent, and that such duties are in no sense whatever for revenue only, but are positively prohibitory in their character and flatly in violation of the Democratic platform, and if this policy is to prevail in regard to one part of the cotton industry it should be carried straight through the bill and take in knit goods, and reach out to all of the other schedules of the tariff law.

If the tariff is to be reformed, let it be done on national and not on sectional lines. For one, I am not yet ready to make tariff rates for the avowed purpose of transferring industries from one part of the country to another, as indicated by one gentleman in the debate on this bill last summer, when he said, "We in the South intend to make New England mill owners come and put their mills in the South or else go out of business."

If we have sinned heretofore in ignorance, that is no excuse for sinning now against the light and knowledge which the Tariff Board has given us concerning the cotton and woolen schedules, and if we are to have an excess of 36 per cent over and above the difference in cost on low numbers of cotton yarns and far more than that on plain woven cotton fabrics, I want to see like rates of duty written into the farmers free-list bill, the metal, chemical, and woolen schedules, and it does not make the slightest difference to me whether it is done under the name of a revenue, a protective, or a prohibitory tariff.

When Schedule K was under consideration we heard much from our Democratic friends of the claim that the ad valorem

equivalents of duties found therein were in some cases higher on the fabrics used by the majority of the people than on those which were ordinarily purchased by the rich or well-to-do. Whatever there is to that claim is due to the specific duty placed upon the raw material.

In the cotton schedule there is no duty on the raw material, and I desire now to reverse the situation and show to our Democratic friends precisely what they have done with reference to white goods and calicoes, which are the fabrics from which very much of the clothing of the great mass of the people of this country is made.

Sample No. 41, an American-made calico, sold in 1911 at wholesale at 4.11 cents per yard, as against an English selling price of 5.09 cents, or 23.8 per cent less than the Englishman was selling it for. That fabric carries in the substitute bill a duty of 10 per cent, but in the Underwood bill a duty of 20 per cent.

If the tariff is a tax added in all cases as they claimed in the discussion on the wool schedule during the extra session, do our Democratic friends intend by continuing their duty of 20 per cent, which was proposed last summer, to increase the cost of clothing to the poor people of this country beyond the point indicated by the report of the Tariff Board as fair and reasonable? Why will they not frankly acknowledge their mistake and at least accept the provisions of the substitute bill?

Take sample No. 5 of unbleached sheeting. In 1911 this article was sold by the American mills at 7 cents a yard, and at that price showed a profit of 7.3 per cent. The like article in England sold at 8.14 cents per yard, 16 per cent higher than it did in this country. The Underwood bill bears a duty of 15 per cent on this fabric; the substitute bill a duty of 5 per cent.

Why do our Democratic friends insist on continuing their mistake of the last session and thus, if their theories are correct, adding to the cost of the articles made from this fabric for the use of our own people? Fifteen per cent is a prohibitive duty. What is the reason that they insist upon it? It will bring no revenue.

Take sample No. 1 of unbleached duck. The Underwood rate is 15 per cent; the rate in the substitute bill is 5 per cent. The American selling price last year was 12.97 cents per yard; the English selling price of the same article was 17.1 cents per yard. They will get no revenue from it, or none that will amount to anything, for the whole business of manufacturing duck is practically controlled by a trust, and the entire revenue received in 1910 was only \$33,195 on this whole line of fabrics.

But why go into further details in regard to these cases? The figures in the report show for themselves, and nowhere more strikingly than in the statement of imports and exports of these plain woven fabrics for the year 1911. Last year we imported 4,180,906 yards of unbleached cotton goods and exported 165,418,000 yards. We imported of bleached cotton goods 14,266,228 yards and exported 27,419,000 yards. We imported of colored goods, and so forth, 37,141,426 yards and exported 153,753,000 yards, a total importation of 55,516,561 yards and a total exportation of 346,590,000 yards.

Imports from United States into Canada.

	Yards.
Unbleached.....	1,495,361
Bleached.....	2,670,215
Colored.....	7,043,064
Total.....	11,208,640

Imports from United States into Great Britain.

	Yards.
Unbleached.....	1,100,000
Bleached.....	764,912
Colored.....	1,225,527
Total.....	3,090,439

Duty from United States 32½ per cent; from Great Britain, 25 per cent.

Under these circumstances is it not trifling with well-established facts—facts fully admitted in the report of the Democratic majority on this bill—when that majority claim that the excessive duties which they have thus fixed on these plain woven fabrics are for revenue purposes, knowing as they do that these fabrics are practically noncompetitive in this market, and that whether the rates are raised or lowered will in no way affect the importations, and that their estimates of increased revenue are thus wholly invalidated and made of no account?

A year ago, without the facts now shown by the Tariff Board before them, the Democratic Party offered their cotton bill, and claimed that more than \$200,000,000 was annually added to the cost of domestic cotton manufactures by reason of the tariff, and that by their reduction of rates and increased importations to the amount of \$11,000,000 worth because of it they would

save \$88,000,000 to the people annually and only lose about two millions of net revenue.

Now, the total production of cotton cloth in 1910 was \$428,203,850. As we imported only 1.79 per cent of that amount and exported 3.18 per cent, the consumption of the American people for 1910 must have been the total production less the surplus exports, making an actual consumption of \$422,251,817. If the respective importations of plain woven and figured cloths given by tariff bulletin No. 5 from Charlotte, N. C., are a fair indication of consumption, more than 50 per cent of our cloth production is plain woven.

As is now shown by the Tariff Board, the American average selling price of these cloths is 20 per cent below the average selling price of our nearest competitor, and this is practically admitted in the report of the Democratic majority. If that is so, and I believe it is, instead of a hypothetical increase in cost of \$200,000,000 on the domestic product because of the present tariff, there is a real, demonstrable, actual saving of more than \$60,000,000 annually to our people as the direct result of the domestic competition which has come as the natural result of the development of this great industry under the Republican system of protection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, if this country could have a guaranty that this tremendous saving under the protective system would not be imperiled by the combination and consolidation of the industry and the elimination of home competition, there would not be the slightest necessity for the reduction of rates to the basis of the facts as found by the Tariff Board, but these combinations and consolidations have already begun, in the Northern and Southern States alike, if the reports in the daily press are correct. It is true that the industry is widely scattered and the raw material for it difficult to be controlled, but it is no more so than the meat and tobacco, the sugar and steel, and combinations in these trades have been successfully made. In no one of them has the killing of domestic competition and the control of the price of the raw material and finished product offered so great a return as the cotton industry would give. In the face of the facts shown by the Tariff Board the political party, either Republican or Democratic, which ignores the situation and permits the possibility of a monopolizing of this great industry by the retention of excessive and unnecessary duties and a consequent increase of the cost of cheap clothing for the masses of our people, will receive and deserve the censure of the people, whether it is done under the specious plea of a tariff for revenue only by the Democratic Party, or by nonaction by the Republican Party. Neither party can complete legislation now, but neither party can shake off the responsibility of impeachment of the facts or else adjusting legislation to them.

The trouble with the Democratic cotton bill is that it is like a last-year's bird's nest, which was a misfit when it was made and is a misfit now, besides being badly battered by a hard winter's storm of facts.

The bill is wrong at both ends—high enough at the beginning to breed combinations and low enough at the end to destroy the knit-goods industry and drive it out of this country, which would be an abject surrender to Germany.

On plushes and velvets, bought and used by the well to do, the Underwood bill puts the same duty as on the plain woven Sunday dress cloth of the working girl.

On full-fashioned hosiery the Underwood rate is 45 per cent.

If Members will turn to page 615 of the board report, they will find comparisons with the corresponding German product, showing an average difference of 58 per cent, and the only excuse I have to offer for the low rates of 55 and 60 per cent in the substitute bill is the reduction in the duties on the yarns from which they are made. On knit underwear the Underwood rate is a straight 30 per cent. In the substitute bill a graded rate of 20, 30, 40, and 45 per cent.

On men's and boys' gloves the Underwood rate is 35 per cent, and in the substitute bill 50 per cent.

Now, there is not the slightest doubt but that with reference to all of these knit goods the Underwood bill can properly be called a bill for revenue only, for it will insure a large revenue immediately and a constantly increasing one year by year as the industry gradually dies out in this country.

But why go further into the details of this guesswork Democratic cotton schedule called a tariff for revenue only?

The sum and substance of it is: High duties and no revenue from the cloth fabrics used by the poor; on the knit fabrics used by the rich, low duties, large revenue, and a young and growing industry strangled.

Indeed, thus far in this Congress the whole Democratic tariff legislation has been a hideous, economic farce. The free-list bill of the extra session was a flat violation of every theory which the party ever held and a repudiation of every promise

made to the American people. It did not give one cent of revenue to the Treasury, but it stripped every particle of protection from nearly \$3,000,000,000 worth of American products. That was a sectional tariff for politics only, and for all time to come will hold a unique place in American history as a monumental specimen of class legislation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The extra-session attempts to revise the metal and chemical schedules were stabs in the dark at the system of protection and amazing mistakes which have since been repudiated by their authors with as cheerful unanimity as that with which they approved them six months before.

The Democratic revision of the chemical schedule for revenue only at this session and this substitute Republican revision of the cotton schedule based on the report of the Tariff Board demonstrate the irreconcilable conflict between a tariff for revenue and a tariff for protection.

Under the application of the latter policy all noncompetitive raw materials must be admitted free of duty, and as our industries develop and domestic costs are lessened it follows that the free list of finished products can be gradually enlarged, tariffs materially reduced, and at the same time the American wage scale and standard of living maintained, or what in my judgment is better yet, duties reduced in part and a higher wage scale and better standard of living made possible for the men and women employed in industrial pursuits.

No better illustration of this could be found than is afforded by the progress of the cotton industry.

On the other hand, with \$48,000,000 worth of raw materials for the chemical industry taken from the free list of the Payne bill and increased in cost by a Democratic revenue duty, and with reduced duties on the finished product at the same time, there is no possible place from which the reduction can come except from the wages of labor.

It is not a question of the amount of taxation, for in the aggregate that must be the same in either case, for the expenses of Government must be met.

It is simply and solely whether in applying those taxes it shall be done in such a way as to encourage and develop our own industries or the industries of Europe.

It is whether we shall make life better—and better, worth living here—or sacrifice our own people to the uplifting of the people in other lands.

It is a question of a plenty of work and good wages or no work or low wages.

The two policies are before you. "Choose you this day which you will serve." [Applause on the Republican side.]

The following is submitted as an appendix:

A REPUBLICAN PROTECTIVE SCHEDULE I BASED ON THE REPORT OF THE TARIFF BOARD, RELATING TO PRODUCTS COMPOSED WHOLLY OR IN CHIEF VALUE OF COTTON.

A bill (H. R. —) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out all of the paragraphs of Schedule I of section 1 of said act from 313 to 332, inclusive of both, and inserting in place thereof the following:

1. Cotton card laps, sliver, roving, or roping, 5 per cent ad valorem. (NOTE.—Present law, ad valorem, 35 per cent; Underwood, 10 per cent. Not practicable to import in large quantities.)

2. Cotton waste and flocks manufactured, 10 per cent ad valorem; antiseptic, medicated, or sterilized cotton, cotton waste, or flocks, 20 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law, 20 per cent; Underwood, 5 per cent.)

3. Cotton yarns in the grey, or otherwise, not advanced beyond the condition of singles, by grouping or twisting two or more single yarns together, not exceeding No. 40, 7½ per cent ad valorem.

Exceeding No. 40 and not exceeding No. 80, 10 per cent ad valorem. Exceeding No. 80, 15 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law, up to No. 15, 12.7 per cent; Nos. 16 to 30, 15.37 per cent; Nos. 31 to 40, 22.12 per cent; Nos. 41 to 80, 23.3 per cent; Nos. 100 to 120, 27.12 per cent; remainder, 15 per cent; total grey single for 1911, 16.39 per cent; colored, etc., total, 30 per cent. Underwood, up to No. 50, 10 per cent; Nos. 51 to 100, 15 per cent; above No. 100, 20 per cent.)

4. Cotton yarn or thread not otherwise provided for, in the grey or otherwise, advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more single yarns together, and cable laid yarns or threads, in the grey or otherwise, made by grouping or twisting two or more twisted yarns or threads together, shall be subject to the same rates of duty as the single yarns from which they are made, and in addition thereto 5 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law, total cable laid, etc., 30.52 per cent; colored, 20.54 per cent; single, mercerized, 23 per cent; total, all yarns, 30.5 per cent. Underwood, yarns advanced same rate as singles.)

Spool thread of cotton, crochet, darning, and embroidery cottons on spools, shall be dutiable at the same rates of duty as the single yarns from which they are made.

(NOTE.—Present law, thread average of all, 24 per cent. Underwood, 15 per cent.)

Differences in yarn conversion costs between United States and England (p. 423): Yarns No. 30 filling, 3.4 per cent; No. 40, 4.5 per cent; yarns No. 30 warp, 6.8 per cent; No. 40, 8 per cent; average, 5.7 per

cent. Yarns No. 50 filling, 6.6 per cent; No. 60, 7.5 per cent; No. 70, 8.9 per cent; yarns No. 50 warp, 10 per cent; average, 8.5 per cent.

Ten per cent added to English cost to make selling price on which to figure duty. No yarns made for sale in this country above No. 140. Total imports of yarns to production, four-tenths of 1 per cent. Total imports of thread, 2½ per cent of home production.

One company controls thread trade in Great Britain, United States, Canada, Russia, Austria, Germany, France, and Spain and fills orders from local factories.)

5. Cotton cloth, plain woven, in the gray, or bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, mercerized, or otherwise finished, containing not more than 5 square yards to the pound, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Containing more than 5 and not more than 7½ square yards to the pound, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Containing more than 7½ square yards to the pound, 15 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law, average of all cotton cloth containing only ordinary warp and filling threads either in the gray or bleached, or dyed, etc., 39.54 per cent. Underwood, made from No. 50 yarn or less, 15 per cent; Nos. 50 to 100, inclusive, 20 per cent; above No. 100, 25 per cent; if bleached, dyed, etc., No. 50 yarn or less, 20 per cent; Nos. 50 to 100, inclusive, 25 per cent; above No. 100, 30 per cent.)

These cloths principally woven on automatic looms, see pages 490 to 495 of report. Costs of cloth from low-cost mills. Industry depressed in 1911. Trade-union rules as to looms run may be changed in either country. For finishing costs see page 502. The duties named herein should cover all contingencies. Wages have been advanced since Tariff Board figures were taken.)

6. Cotton cloth, fancy woven, in the gray, or bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, mercerized, or otherwise finished, containing figures produced by various weaving devices known as dobby, drop-box, leno, lappet, swivel, or any other name except Jacquard, 20 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law. Average of fancy cotton cloth containing other than ordinary warp and filling threads, gray, bleached, dyed, etc., 49.13 per cent; Underwood, by number of threads.)

7. Cotton cloth woven by means of the Jacquard attachment, not otherwise provided for, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Cotton table damask, 25 per cent ad valorem; manufactures of cotton table damask, or of which cotton table damask is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law. Cotton damask, 40 per cent; Underwood, by number of threads.)

8. Cloths containing silk or artificial silk, in which cotton is the component material of chief value, shall be subject to the same rates of duty as cotton cloths of similar weave, and in addition thereto 5 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law 1911, 50 to 58 per cent; Underwood, 30 per cent.) Clause 8. If silk exceeds 10 per cent in quantity, it will be of chief value and go into silk schedule.)

9. Cotton cloths filled or coated, in whole or in part, including oil-cloth of cotton, waterproof cloths composed of cotton or in which cotton is the component material of chief value, 20 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law 1911, 42 to 50 per cent; Underwood, filled or coated, 25 per cent; waterproof, 25 per cent.)

10. Handkerchiefs or mullers of cotton, in the piece or otherwise, finished or unfinished, hemstitched or not, not otherwise specially provided for, shall pay the same rate of duty as the cloth of which they are made, and in addition thereto 5 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law average, 55.11 per cent; Underwood, all, 30 per cent.)

11. Plushes, velvets, velveteens, corduroys, and all pile fabrics made of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, whether the pile covers the entire surface or not:

Uncut, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Cut, in whole or in part, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Provided, That manufactures or articles in any form, including such as are commonly known as bias dress facings or skirt bindings, made or cut from plushes, velvets, or other pile fabrics composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, shall be subject to the same rates of duty as the fabrics from which they are made.

(NOTE.—Present law average, 52.85 per cent; Underwood, all, 30 per cent.)

12. Curtains, table covers, and all articles manufactured of cotton chenille, or of which cotton chenille is the component material of chief value; cotton reps, Jacquard figured tapestry and Jacquard figured upholstery goods, weighing over 6 ounces per square yard, made of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 40 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law, 50 per cent; Underwood, no distinction in weight, 35 per cent.)

13. Stockings, hose, and half hose, made wholly or in part on knitting machines or frames, commercially known as seamless, composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 20 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law, 30 per cent; Underwood, 20 per cent.)

14. Stockings, hose, or half hose, made wholly or in part on knitting machines or frames or knit by hand and commercially known as full-fashioned, composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, valued at not more than \$2 per dozen pairs, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than \$2 per dozen pairs, 60 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law, 55 to 92 per cent; Underwood, 45 per cent.)

15. Shirts and drawers, pants, vests, union suits, combination suits, tights, sweaters, corset covers, and all underwear of every description, made wholly or in part on knitting machines or frames or knit by hand, finished or unfinished, not otherwise provided for, composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, valued at not more than \$1.50 per dozen garments, 20 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than \$1.50 per dozen garments and not more than \$3 per dozen garments, 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than \$3 per dozen garments and not more than \$6 per dozen garments, 40 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than \$6 per dozen garments, 45 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law, 63 to 50 per cent; Underwood, 30 per cent.)

16. Men's and boys' gloves, knitted or woven, composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 50 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law, 86 to 50 per cent; Underwood, 35 per cent.)

17. Tire fabric or fabric suitable for use in pneumatic tires, made of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 25 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law, 45 per cent; Underwood, 25 per cent.)

18. Bone casings, garters, suspenders and braces, webs, webbings, and tubing, any of the foregoing composed wholly or in chief value of cotton, or of cotton and india rubber, and not embroidered by hand or machinery; spindle banding, woven, braided or twisted lamp, stove, or candle wicking; loom harness, healds or collars; boot, shoe, and corset lacings; labels for garments or other articles, composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Belt for machinery made of cotton and india rubber, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 20 per cent ad valorem.

19. Clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, wholly or partly manufactured, not specially provided for, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton, 30 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law, 50 per cent; Underwood, 30 per cent; collars and cuffs, 25 per cent.)

20. All articles made from cotton cloth, and all manufactures of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for, 30 per cent ad valorem.

(NOTE.—Present law, 45 per cent; Underwood, 30 per cent.)

21. The term cotton cloth wherever used in the paragraphs of this schedule, unless otherwise specially provided, shall be held to include all woven fabrics composed wholly or in chief value of cotton, in the piece or cut in lengths, and shall not include any article finished, or unfinished, made from cotton cloth.

SEC. 2. That the last clause of paragraph 347 of said act of August 5, 1909, is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"Waterproof cloth composed of vegetable fiber other than cotton, whether composed in part of india rubber or otherwise, 10 cents per square yard and 20 per cent ad valorem."

SEC. 3. That paragraph 347 of said act of August 5, 1909, is hereby amended by adding the following proviso: "Provided, That none of the foregoing shall apply to coated or filled cotton cloth, or articles made therefrom."

SEC. 4. That paragraph 348 of said act of August 5, 1909, is hereby amended so as to read as follows: "Shirt collars and cuffs, composed of linen, or of which linen is the component material of chief value, 40 cents per dozen pieces and 20 per cent ad valorem."

SEC. 5. That paragraph 349 of said act of August 5, 1909, is hereby amended by striking out therefrom the words "webs and webbings."

(NOTE.—Total production of the industry for 1910, \$628,391,813; total production of cloth only, \$428,203,850; per cent of imports to total production, 1.79; per cent of exports to total production, 3.18; per cent of cloth imports to cloth production, 2.62; per cent of cloth exports to cloth production, 4.66 (see p. 177).)

THE TARIFF BOARD,
Treasury Building, Washington, May 25, 1912.

HON. EBENEZER J. HILL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HILL: Referring to your questions in conversation with Mr. Cowgill regarding the accuracy of the cost figures in our cotton report and your request that a statement be made in writing, I beg to say that in all instances where reports were obtained from cotton-manufacturing companies the results of our cost extensions were carefully examined by the officers of the mill before the report was forwarded to the Tariff Board. This examination was complete, and went into each detail of the extensions rather than merely to have the officers sign their names without making a close examination. The cost extension figures were carefully compared with the cost extension made by the mills, and all the reports forwarded to the board were agreed by the officers of the company and representatives of the board to be correct. As to the accuracy of these extensions, I wish to state that the total expenditures of the company were carefully checked to agree with the figures published in their annual financial statement. Using these sums as a basis, we then made up our own cost statement according to our own methods, which we believe to be accurate and not merely the accepting of the company's own estimates of cost.

In one instance a company was doing an \$8,000,000 annual business; after the costs had been extended for this company and the total number of yards of each kind of goods multiplied by the cost per yard, as shown by the report, the figures checked within \$8.33 of the total amount of money expended by this company in manufacture during the year for which the costs were taken. In another case, by the same method, the variation amounted to \$332. The greatest variation in any of the reports was in the case of a company doing a \$2,000,000 annual business where, by multiplying the number of yards produced by the cost per yard ascertained by us, the difference amounted to \$3,500. But this difference would not affect the costs in the sixth decimal place.

In every case the companies agreed, after a careful examination, that our costs were correct, and in some few cases the mills have adopted our cost extensions in toto, while in others our system of extensions have been adopted at least in part.

These facts I believe fully justify the statement that the most accurate costs possible have been obtained.

Very truly, yours,

HENRY C. EMERY, Chairman.

List of 40 samples where the American selling price is less than the English selling price without any duty.

Sample No.	Trade name of cloth.	American cost excluding selling expense.	American cost including selling expense.	American selling price.	English selling price.	Proposed duty.	English selling price plus duty.
						Per ct.	
1	Duck.....	\$0.1020	\$0.1140	\$0.1297	\$0.1710	5	\$0.1795
2	do.....	.0838	.0889	.1085	.1384	5	.1453
3	Osnaburg.....	(1)	(1)	.0765	.0768	5	.0806
4	Heavy sheeting.....	.0515	.0541	.0561	.0750	5	.0787
5	Sheeting.....	.0600	.0652	.0700	.0814	5	.0855
6	Brown domestic.....	.0491	.0535	.0600	.0659	5	.0692
7	Brown drill.....	.0700	.0767	.0787	.0918	5	.0964
8	Canton flannel.....	.0778	.0855	.0898	.1137	5	.1194
9	Cheesecloth.....	.0210	.0192	.0262	.0362	15	.0416
12	Bleached sheeting.....	.0533	.0564	.0512	.0580	15	.0667
13	Shirting.....	.0654	.0694	.0950	.1123	5	.1179
18	India linen.....	.0573	.0588	.0712	.0806	15	.0927
22	Checked nainsook.....	.0574	.0590	.0625	.0736	5	.0773
24	Pique or welt.....	.0832	.0856	.1200	.1358	5	.1426

List of 40 samples where the American selling price is less than the English selling price without any duty—Continued.

Sample No.	Trade name of cloth.	American cost excluding selling expense.	American cost including selling expense.	American selling price.	English selling price.	Proposed duty.	English selling price plus duty.
20	Curtain swiss or madras.	\$0.0747	\$0.0788	\$0.0778	\$0.0813	Per ct.	\$0.0976
31	Fancy swiss.	.1035	.1214	.1400	.1440	25	.1800
32	Lappet dotted swiss.	.0584	.0600	.0650	.0737	15	.0848
33	Mercerized jacquard.	.0964	.1019	.1050	.1137	25	.1421
37	Striped marquisette.	.0669	.0829	.1250	.1492	15	.1716
39	Cotton challie.	.0407	.0426	.0384	.0600	10	.0660
40	Printed lawn.	.0357	.0376	.0360	.0470	15	.0541
41	Calico print.	.0417	.0419	.0411	.0509	10	.0560
42	do.	.0479	.0500	.0452	.0763	10	.0839
43	do.	.0539	.0544	.0497	.0659	10	.0725
44	Printed percale.	.0579	.0608	.0675	.0757	10	.0833
46	Printed organdie.	.0577	.0581	.0650	.0679	15	.0781
51	Scrim.	.0675	.0736	.1033	.1044	10	.1148
52	Crepé kimona cloth.	.0896	.0914	.1150	.1191	5	.1250
55	Galatea cloth.	.0661	.1000	.1150	.1254	5	.1317
59	Madras shirting.	.1138	.1139	.1150	.1189	10	.1308
61	Book cloth.	.0626	.0687	.0728	.0893	20	.1071
67	Paplin.	.0815	.0975	.1250	.1260	5	.1329
69	Sateen.	.0924	.0984	.0921	.0950	5	.0997
70	do.	.1109	.1187	.1400	.1453	5	.1526
73	Cheviot shirting.	.0682	.0711	.0700	.0948	5	.0995
74	Madras.	.0656	.0684	.0675	.0869	5	.0912
77	Ticking.	.1237	.1291	.1300	.1779	5	.1868
79	Cotton plaids.	.0587	.0642	.0600	.0909	5	.1017
81	Fancy gingham.	.0512	.0541	.0687	.0982	20	.1178
82	Gingham.	.0512	.0541	.0687	.0923	20	.1103
Total.....		2.7302	2.9099	3.2937	3.8865	405	4.2658
Average.....		.0700	.0746	.0823	.0971	10.12	.1066

Per cent.

Margin between American cost plus selling expenses and the American selling price..... 13.2

Margin between American cost plus selling expenses and English selling price without duty..... 33.5

Margin between American cost plus selling expenses and English selling price plus the proposed duty..... 40.6

In addition to the English selling price plus the duty there is an actual expense of 5 per cent for freight and landing charges which has not been added, which will be an additional protection of..... 5.5

NOTE.—Under conditions existing in 1911, the American selling prices in this list were fixed by domestic competition and were not controlled by the present tariff law.

List of 26 samples where the American cost plus the selling expense is less than the English selling price without any duty.

Sample No.	Trade name of cloth.	American cost excluding selling expense.	American cost including selling expense.	American selling price.	English selling price.	Proposed duty.	English selling price plus duty.
11	Linen finish suiting.	\$0.0733	\$0.0785	\$0.0875	\$0.0790	Per ct.	\$0.0829
15	Long cloth.	.0534	.0564	.0625	.0606	10	.0693
17	Nainsook.	.0519	.0573	.0800	.0606	15	.0696
19	Persian lawn.	.0720	.0725	.0900	.0847	15	.0974
26	Checked lawn.	.0719	.0725	.1150	.0910	20	.1092
27	Mercerized corded check.	.0980	.1166	.1450	.1241	20	.1483
28	Dotted swiss check.	.1070	.1125	.1300	.1241	20	.1489
29	Dotted swiss.	.0773	.0813	.1250	.1097	20	.1316
34	Fancy white goods.	.0960	.1216	.2000	.1544	20	.1852
36	Marquisette.	.0826	.1022	.1450	.1286	20	.1543
45	Printed lawn.	.0485	.0488	.0650	.0560	15	.0644
47	Printed batiste.	.0671	.0675	.0850	.0721	15	.0829
49	Printed lawn.	.0815	.0870	.1050	.0854	15	.1016
64	Pongee.	.0715	.0716	.0825	.0783	10	.0861
65	Soisette.	.1083	.1100	.1500	.1164	10	.1280
66	Pongee.	.0900	.0975	.1250	.1164	10	.1280
71	Chambray gingham.	.0541	.0575	.0800	.0653	10	.0718
72	do.	.0541	.0575	.0800	.0626	15	.0719
75	Gingham.	.0580	.0622	.0850	.0783	20	.0939
76	Outing flannel.	.0553	.0605	.0700	.0685	5	.0719
83	Fancy gingham.	.0975	.1061	.1450	.1215	20	.1458
86	Fancy wash fabric.	.0966	.1050	.1426	.1189	20	.1426
89	Turkey red damask.	.2105	.2283	.3022	.2882	25	.3602
98	Silk mull.	.0323	.0942	.1400	.1206	20	.1447
99	Dotted silk mull.	.0902	.0980	.1600	.1247	25	.1558
100	Jacquard swiss mull.	.1048	.1061	.1750	.1335	30	.1735
Total.....		2.1776	2.3292	3.1723	2.7216	430	3.2177
Average.....		.0837	.0895	.1220	.1046	16.53	.1237

Per cent.

Margin between American cost plus selling expense and the American selling price..... 36.2

Margin between American cost plus selling expense and English selling price without any duty..... 16.8

Margin between American cost plus selling expense and English selling price plus proposed duty..... 38.1

In addition to the English selling price plus the duty there is an actual expense of 5 per cent for freight and landing charges which has not been added, which will be an additional protection of 5.0 per cent.

List of 17 samples where the American cost plus selling expense is less than the English selling price plus the proposed duty.

Sample No.	Trade name of cloth.	American cost excluding selling expense.	American cost including selling expense.	American selling price.	English selling price.	Proposed duty.	English selling price plus duty.
14	Wide sheeting.	\$0.1962	\$0.2005	\$0.2042	\$0.1984	Per ct.	\$0.2083
16	English long cloth.	.0720	.0741	.0825	.0731	10	.0804
20	Persian lawn.	.0887	.1033	.1114	.0991	15	.1147
21	Fancy white goods.	.0872	.1000	.1090	.0930	20	.1116
23	Dimity check.	.0576	.0613	.0650	.0603	20	.0727
25	Fancy white goods.	.1097	.1283	.1450	.1223	20	.1473
38	Table damask.	.2003	.2135	.2250	.2001	25	.2501
48	Printed lawn.	.0803	.0858	.1050	.0833	15	.0961
57	Fancy dimity.	.0762	.0822	.1250	.0837	15	.1020
58	Dimity check.	.0692	.0732	.0900	.0719	15	.0823
60	Leno fancy.	.0959	.1029	.1125	.0980	20	.1185
68	Rep.	.3513	.4098	.4750	.3530	40	.4942
80	Scotch gingham.	.1128	.1222	.1430	.1034	20	.1241
90	Corduroy.	.2947	.3729	.5875	.3383	40	.4743
91	Velveteen.	.2121	.2527	.3050	.1997	40	.2735
94	Cotton voile.	.1051	.1078	.1475	.0900	20	.1030
96	Silk gingham.	.1243	.1343	.1500	.1157	25	.1443
Total.....		2.3341	2.6349	3.1766	2.3862	365	3.0093
Average.....		.1373	.1549	.1863	.1403	21.47	.1770

Per cent.

Margin between American cost plus selling expense and the American selling price..... 20.5

Margin between American cost plus selling expense and the English selling price plus the proposed duty..... 14.2

In addition to English selling price plus duty there is an actual expense of 5 per cent for freight and landing charges which has not been added, which will be an additional protection of 6.3 per cent.

List of 8 samples where the American cost plus selling expense is more than the English selling price plus the proposed duty.

Sample No.	Trade name of cloth.	American cost excluding selling expense.	American cost including selling expense.	American selling price.	English selling price.	Proposed duty.	English selling price plus duty.
35	Striped voile.	\$0.1251	\$0.1430	\$0.1460	\$1.1099	Per ct.	\$0.1319
54	Cotton serge.	.1073	.1152	.1350	.0938	20	.1123
56	Printed dimity.	.0780	.0835	.0800	.0647	15	.0749
63	Chambray.	.1324	.1449	.1050	.0896	10	.0985
87	Tissue or fancy fabric.	.1408	.1530	.1550	.1136	20	.1363
93	Cotton tapestry.	.8503	1.0351	1.5000	.6416	40	.6932
95	Novelty gingham.	.1747	.1833	(a)	.1086	25	.1357
97	Silk gingham.	.2343	.2576	.2750	.1792	25	.2240
Total.....		1.8429	2.1170	2.3900	1.4010	175	1.5123
Average.....		.2303	.2646	.3414	.1751	21.87	.2265

Per cent.

Margin between the American cost plus selling expense and the American selling price..... 21.5

Margin of deficiency between the American cost plus selling expense and the English selling price plus the proposed duty..... 16.8

In addition to the English selling price plus the duty there is an actual expense of 5 per cent for freight and landing charges which has not been added, which would reduce the deficiency 4.2 per cent, leaving the deficiency of 12.6 per cent.

NOTES ON LIST NO. 4.

Sample No. 35: Striped voile is an estimated cost, no actual cost being obtained.

Sample No. 54: Cotton serge is a printed stripe compared with a single dyed yarn stripe.

Sample No. 56: Printed dimity, slight variation in organization of the cloths compared.

Sample No. 63: Chambray, American cost obtained in exceptionally high-cost mill, that purchased its yarn in limited quantities.

Sample No. 87: Tissue, considerable variation in the organization of the cloths compared.

Sample No. 93: Cotton tapestry, a high American cost for cards and designs. This cloth was sold in limited quantities with a high selling expense (18 cents per yard).

Sample No. 95: Novelty gingham, American cost estimated.

Sample No. 97: Silk gingham, American cost obtained in high-cost mill, manufacturing a limited quantity of cloth of this construction.

NOTE.—Without regard to differences in selling prices, the differences in costs of conversion are believed to be fully covered by the duties named herein.

CHARACTER OF FUTURE TARIFF LEGISLATION.

The keynote of the declaration of the Republican Party with reference to future tariff legislation is found in the following extract from the Chicago platform, adopted on June 22, 1912:

"We hold that the import duties should be high enough, while yielding a sufficient revenue, to protect adequately American industries and wages. Some of the existing import duties are too high and should be reduced. Readjustment should be made from time to time to conform to changing conditions and to reduce excessive rates, but without injury to any American industry. To accomplish this correct information is indispensable. This information can best be obtained by an

expert commission, as the large volume of useful facts contained in the recent reports of the Tariff Board has demonstrated.

"The pronounced feature of modern industrial life is its enormous diversification. To apply tariff rates justly to these changing conditions requires closer study and more scientific methods than ever before. The Republican Party has shown by its creation of a Tariff Board its recognition of this situation and its determination to be equal to it."

In order that one may see whether the rates provided in the foregoing bill are in accordance with the declarations of the platform a table is herewith submitted, showing the percentage which can be added to the American cost of the following fabrics, plus selling expenses, in New York, with landing charges and the duties paid under this proposed bill. It must be understood that the English competing price includes a profit, but that the profit for the American manufacturer, together with all the contingencies of the business, such as "dumping," future advances in wages, trade-union restrictions, etc., must come from the percentage of margin shown herein.

List of 40 samples where the American selling price is less than the English selling price without any duty.

Margin between American cost plus selling expenses and selling price of competing English goods landed in New York, with proposed duty paid.

Sample No.	Trade name of cloth.	Per cent.
1	Duck.....	62.9
2	do.....	68.9
3	Osnaburg.....	50.9
4	Heavy sheeting.....	36.6
5	Sheeting.....	35.0
6	Brown domestic.....	31.1
7	Brown drill.....	45.1
8	Canton flannel.....	103.5
9	Cheesecloth.....	23.7
12	Bleached sheeting.....	24.1
13	Shirting.....	63.1
18	India linen.....	36.5
12	Checked nainsook.....	72.0
24	Pique or welt.....	29.1
30	Curtain swiss or madras.....	53.7
31	Fancy swiss.....	46.8
32	Lappet dotted swiss.....	44.9
33	Mercerized jacquard.....	112.0
37	Striped marquisette.....	59.8
39	Cotton challie.....	49.3
40	Printed lawn.....	39.1
41	Calico print.....	72.5
42	do.....	38.7
43	do.....	42.5
44	Printed percale.....	39.9
47	Printed organdie.....	42.2
51	Scrim.....	37.2
52	Creme kimona cloth.....	20.3
53	Galatea cloth.....	61.4
59	Madras shirting.....	41.8
61	Book cloth.....	6.8
67	Poplin.....	34.0
69	Sateen.....	39.2
70	do.....	33.8
73	Cheviot shirting.....	50.1
74	Madras.....	63.9
77	Ticking.....	123.2
79	Cotton plaids.....	110.3
81	Fancy gingham.....	
82	Gingham.....	

List of 26 samples where the American cost plus the selling expense is less than the English selling price without any duty.

Margin between American cost plus selling expenses and selling price of competing English goods landed in New York, with proposed duty paid.

Sample No.	Trade name of cloth.	Per cent.
11	Linen-finish suiting.....	11.5
15	Long cloth.....	23.9
17	Nainsook.....	27.3
19	Persian lawn.....	40.2
26	Checked lawn.....	56.5
27	Mercerized corded check.....	29.2
23	Dotted swiss check.....	38.2
29	Dotted swiss.....	67.7
24	Fancy white goods.....	58.2
26	Marquisette.....	56.8
45	Printed lawn.....	37.8
47	Printed batiste.....	28.7
49	Printed lawn.....	22.6
64	Pongee.....	26.1
65	Solsette.....	22.2
66	Pongee.....	37.1
71	Chambray gingham.....	30.7
72	do.....	30.9
75	Gingham.....	16.3
76	Outing flannel.....	24.7
83	Fancy gingham.....	43.3
86	Fancy wash fabric.....	41.7
89	Turkey red damask.....	63.6
98	Silk mull.....	59.5
99	Dotted silk mull.....	64.9
100	Jacquard swiss mull.....	69.4

List of 17 samples where the American cost plus selling expense is less than the English selling price plus the proposed duty.

Margin between American cost plus selling expenses and selling price of competing English goods landed in New York, with proposed duty paid.

Sample No.	Trade name of cloth.	Per cent.
14	Wide sheeting.....	10.1
16	English long cloth.....	14.8
20	Persian lawn.....	16.6
21	Fancy white goods.....	22.3
23	Dimity check.....	24.9
25	Fancy white goods.....	21.1
38	Table damask.....	18.7
46	Printed lawn.....	18.3
57	Fancy dimity.....	16.2
58	Dimity check.....	19.1
60	Leno fancy.....	21.5
68	Rep.....	26.8
80	Scotch gingham.....	7.7
90	Corduroy.....	33.4
91	Velveteen.....	16.9
94	Cotton voile.....	7.4
96	Silk gingham.....	13.9

Comparison of yarn duties.

No. of yarn.	Present law.	Proposed specifics.	Equivalent ad valorem rates 7½ per cent up to and including No. 40; 10 per cent, No. 41 to and including No. 80; 15 per cent, above No. 80.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
15	2.50	1.00	
30	5.00	1.75	1.7242
40	8.00	2.50	2.2215
50	10.00	3.75	3.163
60	12.00	4.50	3.454
70	14.00	5.50	3.714
80	16.00	6.50	
90	18.00	7.50	
100	20.00	8.50	
110	22.00	9.50	
120	24.00	10.50	

Proposition based on specific rates is an advance of one-tenth of a cent per number for each number on yarns exceeding No. 60, or 4½ cents + 6 cents = 10.5 cents for No. 120. The ad valorem rates more than cover the difference in conversion cost.

Mr. PAYNE. I will ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to use some of his time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. So far as I am advised at present, there will be only one closing speech. I may have other requests for time, but I am not prepared to use any of our time now.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, of the many iniquitous things contained in the Payne-Aldrich law the cotton and woolen schedules are the worst. President Taft, while pronouncing the bill as a whole the best tariff law ever enacted, declared that the woolen schedule was indefensible. I think even the President will admit now that the cotton schedule was also indefensible. These two schedules especially were condemned by Progressive Republicans the country over. They were condemned by voters of all parties at the election in 1910 and are largely responsible for the Democratic majority in this House to-day.

Vindication of a position taken is always a pleasant thing, but it is peculiarly so when that vindication comes from a tariff board selected by the same President who condemned Progressive Republicans for taking the position they did.

We contended that the increases in the rates in the cotton schedule were unwarranted from any standpoint and were far beyond any difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. The Tariff Board has so found.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me say just a word with reference to the position of the Democratic majority upon this Tariff Board. I say without any hesitation that, although there are things that may be criticized, so far as the report not being complete is concerned, there is more real information with reference to this subject in that report of the Tariff Board than has been gathered from the beginning of tariff agitation to the present day from any other source. [Applause on the Republican side.] And I say further, without any hesitation, if it had not been for the fact that that Tariff Board is a product of the Republican Party, that if the members of that board had not been appointed

by a Republican President, instead of condemning that report you upon the other side would be quoting from it in your campaign textbook this fall. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The board finds that the difference in cost of production of cotton yarns in the United States and England is from 3.8 per cent to 11.9 per cent ad valorem, while the rates in the Payne-Aldrich law range from 15 to 48 per cent ad valorem. The board finds that the duties are in some cases four and five times greater than the difference in cost of production.

In the case of cotton cloth the rates are even more unjustifiable. We have heard much about the lower wages paid abroad, and it has been assumed by some that the duties should at least equal the difference in wages, thus assuming that there is no difference in efficiency. We have often heard upon this floor the statement made that wages in the Orient are 10 and 15 cents per day, and for that reason alone it was assumed that high tariffs were needed for protection.

The Tariff Board has so completely exploded that bugaboo that I do not think it will be heard of again in this Chamber. But for fear that some gentleman may ignorantly fall into the same error, I wish to spend a moment upon it now. In the debate at the special session upon the cotton schedule the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Austin], speaking of the cotton mills of Japan, said:

Their mills are the best equipped made in the English workshops, and their labor the cheapest on the face of this earth—10 cents for boys and girls, 15 cents for women, and 22 cents for men per day.

A moment later he said:

If this bill should become a law, there is not a cotton mill in a single Southern State that will ever sell a yard of calico on the Pacific coast or in the far Western States in competition with calico made in the mills of Japan.

Now, I do not quote this language for the purpose of criticizing the gentleman from Tennessee, but only to illustrate how lack of information leads to recklessness of statement. In refutation of the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee I ask you to turn to Table 162 of the report of the Tariff Board, which gives a comparison of the employees necessary to operate a 1,000-loom weaving mill in the United States and in Japan. The wages of the weavers in the Japanese mills are, it is true, only 18½ cents per day as against \$1.59 per day in the American mill, but it requires 700 weavers to do the work in a Japanese mill as against only 53 in an American mill, and the total cost per day for weaving in the Japanese mill is \$129.50 as against only \$84.27 in the American mill. Putting it in another way, one American weaver for \$1.59 does as much work as 13 Japanese weavers for \$2.40.

Believing that ghost will not walk again, let us get back to a consideration of the difference in cost of production in this country and England. We find that an American weaver, as a rule, produces a great deal more than his English brother. Quoting from the report of the Tariff Board, on page 11:

In the case of plain looms (not automatic) the English weaver seldom tends more than 4 looms, while in this country a weaver rarely tends less than 6, and more frequently 8 or even 12, if equipped with "warp stop motions."

The report then goes on to say that automatic looms are little used in England, while there are over 200,000 in the United States, and on such looms the American weaver commonly tends 20 and sometimes as high as 28.

After going into a full recital of the facts, the board, on page 12 of the report, sums up the matter as follows:

Keeping the above facts in mind, it may be stated that in the case of a large variety of plain goods the labor cost of turning yarn into cloth in the United States is not greater, and in some cases is lower, than in England.

The report then goes on to state that in finer goods the cost is greater in this country, and we then find the following:

Figures are presented in the report showing that although labor costs in the cotton industry are in many cases lower in the United States than England, yet the actual hourly earnings in this country are, in most of the principal occupations, much greater.

This corroborates the assertion made by most economists that higher wages may often lower labor costs.

In the Payne-Aldrich law higher rates of duty are imposed upon cloth which is bleached, printed, dyed, mercerized, and so forth. Concerning this the board finds, on page 13:

A comparison of 60 specific samples for which finishing data were obtained shows that in most cases the difference between the charges in the two countries were slight, but that the American charges were slightly lower on most of the samples.

Another interesting comparison is furnished by Table 136, where 100 samples of cloth are taken, ranging from calico print to cotton tapestry, and a comparison is made between the American cost of production, both including and excluding selling expense and the English selling price, which of course includes a profit to the English manufacturer.

On 40 of the 100 samples the English price is 42.3 per cent greater than the American cost, excluding selling expense. It is 33.5 per cent greater, including selling expense.

On these 40 samples it is clear that there should be no duty at all, either from the Republican or Democratic standpoints, for any duty is practically prohibitive. From a Republican standpoint no duty is needed to protect the American manufacturer. From a Democratic standpoint no duty should be imposed, for it will produce no revenue, and from their standpoint is nothing but a tax upon the American people, a "robbery," as they put it, enriching the tariff barons alone. That is what they did in their bill at the special session and what they have done in this bill when on these 40 samples they placed duties ranging from 15 to 30 per cent ad valorem.

Again returning to the 100 samples compared by the Tariff Board, in addition to the 40 I have already spoken of, there are 26 samples where the American cost both including and excluding selling expense is less than the English price, but the margin of difference is not so great as in the case of the 40 samples. Of these 26 samples the English selling price is 25 per cent greater than the American cost, excluding selling expense. It is 16.8 per cent greater, including selling expense. It is clear that this margin is amply sufficient to enable the American manufacturer to successfully compete with the English price, but remembering that the English price includes a profit, and we do not know exactly what English cost is, a small duty would be justified both from the standpoint of protection and revenue.

So far, then, out of 100 samples of cotton cloth we have 66 of them where the average English price is from 16.8 per cent to 33.5 per cent greater than the average American cost of production, including selling expense.

There are 25 samples where the average English price is less than the American cost of production. On 17 of the samples the English price is 2 per cent greater than the American cost, excluding selling expense, but including selling expense the American cost is 10.4 per cent greater than the English selling price.

On 8 samples the American cost, both including and excluding selling expense, is greater than the English price. It is 31.5 per cent greater excluding and 51.1 per cent greater including selling expense. On these 25 samples therefore a substantial duty is justified both from a protective and a revenue standpoint.

I have not the time to analyze the entire report of the Tariff Board and shall confine myself to this statement regarding cotton yarn and cotton cloth. I will, however, frankly state that upon the balance of the schedule the report of the board is not so complete as it should be, and as I am satisfied it would have been could the board have had further time to complete their investigation. However, we have sufficient information to deal intelligently with every paragraph of the schedule.

We have before us the Democratic bill, which is the same bill that was passed at the special session. I propose in the time I have left to discuss that bill and make some comparisons between it and the report of the Tariff Board.

When the bill was under consideration at the special session I voted for it and spoke for it. I undertook to show then that notwithstanding its label, and notwithstanding the declaration of its sponsors, it was in the main a protective measure.

The report of the Tariff Board now conclusively shows that this Democratic bill was and is a protective measure but that many of the rates in it are higher than can possibly be indorsed by any Republican who stands upon the Chicago platform of 1908. After a careful examination of the report of the board I was satisfied that if our Democratic friends brought in a bill at this session revising the cotton schedule that the rates in it would, upon such a staple necessity as cotton cloth, be much lower than those in the bill passed last year, but to my utter amazement we find that notwithstanding the information they now have, they offer the same bill as they did at the special session, and we have to-day a situation unparalleled in American history of the Democratic Party offering a tariff bill that carries prohibitive duties upon necessities of life which are much higher than the Republican Party can indorse. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Never again can the Democratic Party boast that it stands for a tariff for revenue only. Never again can it, without the rankest hypocrisy, go before the American people and denounce the robber tariff barons and condemn the Republican Party for taxing the people for the benefit of the cotton manufacturer. What explanation there may be for this strange attitude of the Democratic Party I will not undertake to say. The fact that there are very large cotton mills in the South

may be one reason, but I am more inclined to think that it is merely another evidence of the stubbornness of the Democracy, and this exhibition makes the emblem of the Democratic Party more appropriate than ever.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LENROOT. I will.

Mr. CANNON. I understand from reports in the newspapers and otherwise that Marshall Field & Co. have bought a large number of these mills that make the kind of cotton cloth to which the gentleman refers, and we all understand that Marshall Field & Co. would not object to a prohibitive duty. Although they are the great distributing merchants in our Middle West, they have sense enough to keep quiet when their friends are around.

Mr. LENROOT. That may be, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. I am only stating what I understand from the reports.

Mr. LENROOT. I understand the gentleman. But after all, and to be entirely fair to the Democratic majority, they are only pursuing their ordinary course of seldom being willing to progress and never able to learn. They are always looking backward, never forward, so far as constructive statesmanship is concerned. To paraphrase and adapt a statement of the candidate of the Democratic Party for President, Woodrow Wilson: "The Democratic majority in this House occupies a place in the ship of state—in the stern, looking back at the wake of the ship." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

But it is not for me to attempt to explain the utterly indefensible position of the Democratic majority with respect to this bill. We know that it has information now from a Tariff Board appointed by a Republican President, a Tariff Board the reports of which the Democrats said less than a year ago would be unreliable because they would unduly favor the protected interests of the country.

They know that that charge has fallen to the ground. They know that the report of the Tariff Board will not sustain many of the rates in this bill. They know that many of the rates in this bill should be lower, according to the report of the board.

The Democratic majority are not brave enough nor patriotic enough to frankly confess that they were mistaken as to the nonpartisan character of the Tariff Board. They are not brave enough nor patriotic enough to frankly take advantage of the report of the board in the interest of the American people. They evidently take the position that they would rather be consistent than right, and they are very seldom either. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I am confirmed in this by an article in the Washington Post of yesterday morning. I intended to have it with me, but it is an interview with the gentleman from New York [Mr. REDFIELD], who had just come from a conference with Gov. Wilson, the Democratic candidate. You remember at that interview he stated that the policy of the Democratic Party would be a gradual reduction of the tariff, and that they would not attempt to come at one time down to a revenue tariff only, and he gave a specific illustration; that if the reduction of 30 points was necessary to bring the tariff down to a revenue basis, they would favor first bringing it down 15 points, or halfway. Now, they might make that kind of contention were it not for the fact that only the day before yesterday that very proposition was presented to this House, the very proposition that Mr. REDFIELD contends for, in the woolen bill that came from the Senate, and the Democratic majority, then voiced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] took the position that they were not in favor of going halfway; they were all in favor of making no reduction unless they could cut to the very bottom, and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the position the Democratic majority would like to take is that to avoid any revision now, for the benefit of the protective manufacturers, they say, "We will not have any tariff revision now; we will let you alone." They say, "When we get into power do not worry, because then we will vote for such reductions as we are voting against now."

But I now desire to submit some proof that many of the rates in this Democratic bill are too high, are prohibitive, and will produce no revenue.

The first paragraph relates to cotton yarn and imposes duties according to numbers from 10 per cent to 20 per cent ad valorem. The Tariff Board finds that the difference in cost of production of yarns, except those of the highest numbers, ranges from 3.8 per cent to 11.9 per cent ad valorem, while the lowest rate in this Democratic bill is 10 per cent ad valorem.

Paragraph 3 relates to cotton cloth on which duties are imposed ranging from 15 per cent ad valorem, and in addition 5 per cent is added if the cloth is bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or mercerized.

The report of the board conclusively shows that these rates can not be sustained from a revenue standpoint, and they are too high from a protective standpoint. Cotton cloth enters into the cost of living of every American home, and if the Democratic majority was at all sincere in its profession of concern for the American people they would have reduced the rates in this paragraph of the bill. The report of the board shows conclusively that the coarser and heavier fabrics are produced cheaper here than abroad, and that a duty of 15 per cent, as proposed in this bill, can not possibly be a revenue producer. It is just as prohibitive, as far as importations are concerned, as is the present law.

I am aware that the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and others upon the Democratic side attempt to meet this criticism by declaring that the rates proposed in the present bill are a great reduction from those contained in the Payne-Aldrich law; that they do not claim that the rates could not be made much lower without injury to the American industry; that they are making gradual reductions and do not propose to go the whole distance at one time. But, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama and the Democratic majority is estopped from making any such claim now. To make such a claim is an admission by them that this bill does contain protective rates, a proposition which was most vigorously denied when this same bill was under consideration at the special session. It was then claimed by every Democratic Member who spoke upon the subject that this bill was purely a revenue measure; that it had no other design than to produce revenue.

The majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, in their report upon this bill at the special session, used the following language:

The most important feature to be kept in mind in revising Schedule I in the interest of the welfare of the general public is that the rates be made truly competitive as far as possible—that is, that they be made low enough to permit potential competition from imports for the sake of natural and proper regulation of domestic prices.

The gentleman from Alabama, in opening the debate upon this bill at the special session, had a colloquy with the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS], as follows:

Mr. HINDS. The gentleman says this cotton bill is framed solely to the end of the revenue in view?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think the gentleman can doubt that proposition.

Mr. HINDS. Therefore, does the gentleman say also that it leaves out entirely the principle of protection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Absolutely, so far as my knowledge is concerned.

It therefore does not lie in the mouth of any Democrat to now claim that when this bill was presented at the special session that there was in the minds of the Democratic majority any other thought than that this was purely a revenue measure, and that if enacted into law it would permit a sufficient competition from abroad to regulate prices in this country.

Upon this plain cotton cloth fabric it must be entirely clear now to every Member of the House that the rates in this bill are not sufficiently low to permit any competition, that they are not sufficiently low to provide any revenue to the Government, and I shall await with great curiosity an explanation from the other side as to how they propose to raise revenue for the Government under the rates proposed in the cloth paragraph of this bill. They can only do so by completely reversing their position with reference to the Tariff Board, by claiming that whereas a year ago they claimed that the findings of the Tariff Board would favor protected interests, that now the findings of the Tariff Board are unjust to protected interests in that they do not justify as high tariff rates as protected interests are entitled to receive.

But to get back to the cloth paragraph of the cotton schedule. The report of the board shows that duties greater than 5 to 20 per cent can not be sustained from either a Democratic or Republican standpoint.

But that is not all in this paragraph. The bill adds 5 per cent ad valorem for cloth bleached, dyed, colored, and so forth, or what is known as finishing, while the facts presented by the board show beyond peradventure that the cost of finishing is less in this country than in England. I challenge any Member on the Democratic side of the House to defend this additional rate of 5 per cent, and before this debate is over I demand that they either give some reason for imposing this burden upon the people or else strike it out from the bill.

I can not go through the bill in detail within the time allotted me. According to the report of the board, the other rates in the bill are not greatly different than those warranted by the report of the board. Some duties are higher than are necessary and some are lower than are warranted by the report.

The bill as a whole, as stated by the chairman, reduces duties from 48 per cent ad valorem under the present law to 27 per cent ad valorem. The report of the board shows that the rates

can be still further lowered both from a Democratic and Republican standpoint. From computations which I have made, I am satisfied that an average rate of 20 per cent ad valorem can be sustained from a protective standpoint, and surely a higher rate can not be defended from a revenue standpoint.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] will, I understand, offer a substitute to this bill, levying duties from the standpoint of protection to the American industry. I have carefully gone over his figures, and while some of them are higher than I believe are warranted by the board, yet, recognizing the difficulties of classification, and in view of the fact that the rates proposed by him are lower in the main than in the Democratic bill, I shall have no hesitation in giving it my support.

And in this connection permit me to say that while I have often differed with the gentleman from Connecticut in tariff matters, especially as to the reciprocity bill, too much credit can not be given him for the fearless stand he has taken upon this schedule and upon the woolen schedule. He comes from New England, supposedly the section receiving greater benefits than any other from high protection, but when he has the facts before him as they have been presented by the Tariff Board, he honestly applies those facts to these two tariff bills, regardless of whether such action condemns the Payne-Aldrich bill or not. The American producer has a right to expect protection from undue competition from abroad when the cost of production is greater here. He who demands more than that is not a Republican. He is the greatest enemy the Republican Party has. If in the years to come Republicans generally will follow the example of the gentleman from Connecticut in his treatment of the cotton and woolen schedules, then the principle of protection to American industries will be safely entrenched as one of the established policies of this Nation, and all of the misrepresentations and academic theories of the Democracy shall not prevail against it.

I have said that the general average of the duties in the substitute to be proposed by the gentleman from Connecticut is less than the Democratic bill. The average in the Democratic bill is 27 per cent ad valorem. Now, I ask you to follow me for a moment in the consideration of what these reductions from the Payne-Aldrich law mean to the American people according to Democratic authority.

In the debate upon this bill at the special session the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], a member of the Ways and Means Committee, stated:

It is believed by our committee that the revenue will not be materially disturbed and that the burden of taxation upon the American people will be lifted to the amount of \$200,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON states that the Committee on Ways and Means believed that this bill will save the American people \$200,000,000 annually. While, as a matter of fact, this amount is largely exaggerated, for the purpose of my argument I will assume that it is correct. The Democratic majority can not complain if I make that assumption, for I am merely adopting for the time being their own theory.

If this pending Democratic bill would save the American people \$200,000,000 per year, then the Hill bill, by the same reasoning, would save the American people more than \$221,000,000 per year, for the Democratic bill reduced duties from 48 to 27 per cent ad valorem, while the Hill bill reduced duties from 48 to 25 per cent ad valorem. In other words, the Hill bill reduced duties 48 per cent while the Democratic bill is a reduction of only 44 per cent.

When the vote is taken upon the Hill bill and the solid Democratic majority vote against it, as I expect they will, I give Democratic Members notice now that they will have some explaining to do in the fall campaign. It will not suffice for them to rail against the Payne-Aldrich law.

It is a matter of sincere regret to me that the Republican minority of the Committee on Ways and Means has not seen fit to indorse the Hill bill in a minority report or offer any bill revising the cotton schedule. I believe the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] is the only member of the Republican minority that proposes affirmative action upon the part of the Republicans revising the cotton schedule.

At the special session last year when this same bill was under consideration and just before its passage the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] made the following motion to recommit the bill:

Mr. PAYNE moves to recommit the bill H. R. 12812 to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions to that committee to hold the bill in committee until the Tariff Board makes report to Congress of the information secured by said Tariff Board in regard to the production, manufacture, use, and consumption of cotton goods, and especially covering every element of the cost of production, and to report said bill back to the House with such provisions and amendments as it may deem proper after examination and consideration of the information so reported by the Tariff Board.

The Tariff Board has reported now. The Democratic majority has ignored that report and apparently a majority of the Republican minority of the Committee on Ways and Means has also voted to ignore it, for otherwise they would have presented as a minority a bill revising the cotton schedule.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. With regard to the action taken originally by the minority upon the Hill bill, I can state to the gentleman that it came at a time when definite assurance, practically, had been given by the leader of the majority that a cotton bill would not be reported at this session of Congress. This meeting was called with only a day's notice, and it was the first time that any members of the minority committee had an opportunity to inspect the bill offered by Mr. HILL. Therefore definite action was not taken for the reason stated at the time that the members of the minority desired some further time to look into it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I do not, of course, question the statement of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statement of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, if the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means shall vote for this Hill bill when the vote is taken, then I shall regard it as a complete explanation.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the gentleman that he will be satisfied to some extent, at any rate.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I, of course, in reading the report assumed that that was the action of the minority committee—it so states that they did not propose to offer any affirmative legislation, and I am satisfied, I say, if that was the attitude of the minority of the committee it does not represent the wishes or the sentiments of the Republican membership of this House.

An overwhelming majority of the Republicans in this House are sincere in their desire that this question be investigated by a Tariff Board, and after investigation honestly and impartially made, they are willing to act upon that information. I am confident that the Hill bill will receive practically the unanimous support of this side of the House.

In line with the position taken by a majority of the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means is the attitude of the American Protective Tariff League. As is well known, the American Protective Tariff League vigorously opposed the creation of a Tariff Board, and no tariff could be placed so high that would not meet with its approval. Its membership is made up very largely of that class of citizens who seem to believe that the great purpose of the Constitution of the United States was to protect industrial wrongs. They are loud in their profession of fealty to "constitutional government." They denounce at every opportunity any change in the Constitution, and they grow red in the face condemning such revolutionary theories as the initiative, referendum, and recall. That is, they do that when they fear that those things may interfere in the slightest degree with their control of government and their special privilege existing by virtue of that control.

But such things do not seem dangerous when they would like to use them for their own purposes, to illustrate which I wish to quote from a letter received by me—no doubt similar letters were received by other Members—from Wilbur F. Wake-man, treasurer and general secretary of the Protective Tariff League:

We earnestly recommend that all tariff reduction measures should be submitted to the people of this country in November. We mean by this that the measures now proposed and pending shall be submitted to the voters of this country, and we have not a doubt as to what the voters of this country will decide.

Reference of these measures to the "mob," or to the "bleachers," as my friend from Kansas, Mr. CAMPBELL, would term it, advocated by the treasurer and general secretary of the American Protective Tariff League! Evidently they regard the referendum as a most meritorious thing when used to delay action against the public interest, but a vicious thing when used in the public interest.

I am not one who fears to submit these matters at the coming election, as is suggested by the American Protective Tariff League, but I want definite proposals by the Democratic Party and definite proposals by the Republican Party as to just what they propose to do, as is done in this case by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

But there is no occasion for delaying action. If the people disapprove of any action taken by either Republicans or Democrats, that disapproval will find itself evidenced in tariff legislation enacted at a special session of Congress in 1913.

If the Republican membership of this House shall, in the consideration of this measure, show their sincerity in advocating a tariff board by voting for the Hill bill, which will be proposed, their action will do much to insure a Republican majority in the next House. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has 53½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I favor the bill introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut and shall be unable, in any event, to vote for the bill presented by the Democratic majority. I voted for the La Follette wool bill, although I did not like its general plan, and considered it imperfect in many respects, because I believed it removed the most objectionable features in the present law; but when this opportunity of removing these objectionable features and offering relief against them to the people was given to our Democratic friends, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], speaking for them, told us that they would revise the tariff in their own time, in their own way, and absolutely according to their own plan, or not at all. For myself this reply was not unexpected. They will have an opportunity now to accept a bill which corrects the errors in the cotton schedule and affords the consumer all proper relief. I expect their answer to the proposition made through the bill presented by the gentleman from Connecticut will be the same as before, but I imagine there will be hereafter less of the talk on their part that they desire to relieve the consumer by lowering the tariff rate, and certainly they must abandon their claim that the Republican Party is not willing to do anything in this direction.

If the Underwood bill, now presented by the Democratic majority, removed any of the objectionable features of the present law, or corrected any evil growing out of it, without causing a greater injury, I trust I am not such a hidebound partisan that I would be unwilling to accept it; but the fact is that it makes no improvement on the present law in any direction, corrects no evil existing in it, and must inevitably injure our manufacturers if put in force.

What can be said in defense of a bill, from the standpoint of any Republican, which raises the tariff on goods which are manufactured cheaper here than abroad—upon which the tariff is now prohibitory—but which lowers the duty on goods which are already being imported in large quantities? The great bulk of the cotton goods used in this country are manufactured at home and sold at a less price than they can be bought abroad and shipped here. Upon this class of goods the rates are now prohibitory. The Democratic bill leaves them prohibitory, and even increases them in some instances. The substantial reductions that are made by the Democratic bill are in connection with the goods as to which our manufacturers now with difficulty compete with foreigners and which, as a rule, are used more largely by people in comfortable circumstances.

On the former discussion of the Democratic bill the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] admitted that the rates had been raised on some grades, and excused the raise on the ground that the importations of the goods on which the duties were thus raised were inconsiderable and that the rates had been lowered where the importations had been large. I did not expect to find that the bill had in fact taken a form so absurd, but an examination of it shows that a large portion of it is so drawn as to effectively condemn it.

Lest this statement should seem overdrawn, I propose to support it by a few illustrations, of which I could give a large number did my time permit. During the former debate on this bill it was shown from the report that accompanied it that a very small quantity of bleached muslin cloth, valued not to exceed 9 cents per yard, was imported in 1910. The duty on this, according to the same report, was less than 11 per cent ad valorem, and the small quantity imported showed that it was practically prohibitory. This rate is raised by the Underwood bill to 20 per cent. Perhaps a better illustration of how the Democratic bill works out is found in sample No. 9, referred to in the table of samples given in the tariff report. It is bleached cheesecloth, and is manufactured in this country and sold at the mills for 2.62 cents. The selling price in England is 3.62 cents. In such an instance even a nominal tariff of 5 per cent, proposed by the Hill bill, is unnecessary, but the Underwood bill keeps it at 20 per cent. Unbleached sheeting containing not to exceed 100 threads to the square inch is now quoted by all the mills of this country at lower prices than at the mills of England, yet the duty on this class of goods is kept in the Underwood bill at from 15 to 20 per cent. Sample No. 19 of the Tariff Board, bleached Persian lawn, is made cheaper in this country than

abroad. The Underwood bill puts a tariff on it of 25 per cent. Sample 46, bleached and printed organdie, is also manufactured here cheaper, and again the Underwood bill puts a 25 per cent rate upon it. In the list of 100 samples of various kinds of cloth given in the Tariff Board's report, 40 are shown to be sold at a less price in this country than abroad without any duty, but the Underwood bill still maintains a high rate upon these goods.

Where the rate is prohibitory, to make a new rate which is still prohibitory means nothing. It is a change, but a change that is needless and useless. Staple cotton goods, as I have before stated, are sold in this country at the mill doors for less than they can be bought abroad. What excuse can be given for maintaining rates of which the instances given above are fair examples? Why not bring them down to those fixed by the Republican bill introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL]? I know of no good reason and none can be given unless it be that these goods are largely manufactured by the southern mills; that the southern Democrats are now in control and ready to slash the rates that apply only to the products of the northern mills, but maintain them prohibitory as to factory products of the South. It is true that most of these rates are lower than those under the present law, but the present law affects nobody and injures no one on these staples as to which the American mill is already the cheapest place in all the world at which to buy them. The rates of the Democratic bill are not low enough to affect these mills if they saw fit to go into a combination, rumors of which are now in the air. For real reduction on these goods we must look to the Republican bill, which imposes on them merely a nominal rate.

If the majority desires to eradicate an evil that has grown up under the present law, it might have found an opportunity under the thread schedule. The combination of the thread manufacturers has resulted in the formation of one of the few trusts known to the cotton industry. It would have been supposed, after all the outcry which has been made on the other side against trusts, that this combination would have received a cut in rates deeper than in any other line. A reduction was indeed made, but it was not one that will in the slightest way affect this trust. It should have gone far lower—as the Republican bill does.

When we come to schedules as to which our manufacturers now compete with difficulty with the foreigners, and of which the imports are large and increasing, we find that the revenue principle upon which the Democratic bill was framed has been relentlessly applied. As a matter of course, if severe cuts are made in these schedules the importations will largely increase and we will receive more revenue, but as we do not need the revenue it would hardly seem advisable even from a Democratic standpoint, and certainly this plan can commend itself to no Republican. If more goods are imported, the inevitable result is the displacement of our manufactures and a loss of wages to our workmen. If the tariff is to be framed for revenue only, this is immaterial. For those, however, who wish to see our money kept at home and our wage earners given employment, this is a matter of the highest importance.

An example of how the bill was framed in relation to goods now imported in large quantities abroad is found in the plush schedule, which is reduced by the Underwood bill more than 40 per cent, and in the report accompanying this bill it was estimated that the 1910 exports would increase under it about \$267,000. As a matter of fact, they increased over \$1,400,000 without any change in the law, and now it is proposed to nearly cut the rate in two by the Underwood bill. The result of such a proposition will be simply to close the American mills without any appreciable benefit to the consumer and with a great loss to American labor.

Heretofore, whenever the cotton schedule was mentioned, gentlemen on the other side have presented some tables, made by I know not whom, showing inordinate profits claimed to have been made by some of the great mills which manufacture staple cotton goods. The accuracy of these tables has been denied, but I care nothing about the question so raised at this time. Has this bill sought to reach the great mills? No. It strikes at the small manufacturer—the plush-goods makers, the knit-goods industry, the makers of chenille, and the like. In these goods the imports are already large and increasing. Of the plush goods there was three times as much imported in 1911 as in 1910; of chenille twice as much. So severe reductions in the rates on these goods, as are contemplated by the Underwood bill, simply means that in many branches the American mills and manufacturers will no longer be able to compete and must give way to the foreign producers.

The hosiery schedule, as it now stands, may be admitted to be faulty in some respects, especially in that the duty on cheap hose

ought to be lowered. The small mills making hosiery are scattered all over the country, and the gentleman from Connecticut, in preparing the Republican bill, cut this schedule to the bone. My own calculations, taken from the report of the Tariff Board, would indicate that the industry could not stand the rates which he proposed, but I have such a high opinion of him as an authority on this subject that I yield out of deference to his views. The Democratic majority, not content with these rates, proceeded to go still further and lower and make up a hosiery schedule which, according to the report of the Tariff Board, would close every hosiery mill in this country except those making certain brands of a class not easily obtained abroad. What reason can be given for this? On the former discussion of this bill the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] was asked by the gentleman from New York if he did not know that hosiery and stockings, considering the quality, were cheaper in this country than ever before, notwithstanding an advance of from 25 to 50 per cent in the cost of cotton. The gentleman from Alabama did not deny the claim thus made, but said that it was because of a Republican panic. Where was the "panic"? The same kind of a "panic" now prevails and the same prices on hosiery are maintained. Who is there that does not know that hosiery is cheaper than it was 20 years ago? If there is any doubt upon the subject, I would refer to table No. 4, given by Senator BURTON in his recent speech on the cost of living, which shows the scale of prices on hosiery for each year since 1890. Hosiery is somewhat higher than it was 10 years ago, but the advance is not equal to the proportionate advance in wages or in other commodities. No one claims that there is any trust among the hosiery mills; on the contrary, it is acknowledged that there is the keenest competition between them. This is the only country in the world in which you can buy at any price hose warranted to stand any kind of wear for six months. What reason can be given then for destroying this industry which produced nearly \$60,000,000 worth of manufactured products in 1909?

The knit-goods industry, which is so seriously affected by the Democratic bill, paid \$44,000,000 in wages to the American workman, by him again to be distributed to the farmers and other workmen who supplied the articles that entered into his living expenses.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] stated that the Democratic Members of this House were sent here by the consumers and were interested in the consumers alone. Like the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], I know of no one who is merely a consumer except the tramp and individuals whose occupation is that of collecting rents or cutting off coupons. The producer and consumer must stand together. I speak for perhaps the largest class of producers—the American farmer—who has learned by bitter experience that when the mills are closed and the wages of their operatives stop that the market for his produce is gone. He knows that money sent abroad to buy manufactured goods does not find its way back to him. He has found that he and the mill worker must stand together hand in hand to maintain adequate wages for one and a home market for the other.

It is no argument to say that because the Republican bill averages somewhat lower than the Underwood bill that therefore Republicans should be willing to accept it. Averages are no criterion for that purpose. One might as well tell a farmer that a harness which was weak here and there but had increased strength somewhere else averaged well, or that a wagon tongue that was unnecessarily heavy in front and weak to the point of danger at the rear averaged stronger than one which was made of the proper dimensions, or that a corn planter that dropped one kernel in one hill and five in others was averaging the right number. Each separate item of a tariff bill might be utterly wrong and yet be of the same average as one properly prepared. The reductions in the Hill bill, while far beyond some of those in the Underwood bill in some items, continue to give the active, energetic, and up-to-date manufacturer an opportunity to pursue his business and give employment to his men on the American scale of wages, the highest known in the world. The Underwood bill would accomplish nothing except to ruin the manufacturer in certain lines and deprive his employees of their wages.

I have taken the figures which I present from the report of the Tariff Board. It is not necessary at this time to make any defense of this board. The Underwood bill itself furnishes an unanswerable argument in defense of the Tariff Board report. Who is there that does not know that the Underwood bill would not have been drawn in its present form if the report had been in existence when the bill was prepared? The bill now is only adhered to because to change it would be only to admit the necessity of a Tariff Board, and it would be necessary for the new bill to run the gauntlet of another caucus.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] frankly admits that were it not for the information supplied by the Tariff Board he would not have thought it possible to make the reductions proposed by his bill, and what excuse is given by the Democratic majority for not accepting the rates proposed by him? None whatever, except the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] to which I have already referred, namely, that the majority proposed to revise the tariff in its own way or not at all. I leave it for the public to judge whether this is any defense of the bill in which I have shown such glaring defects to exist.

A favorite phrase with the Members of the Democratic majority when discussing their tariff bills is that they desire to lessen the burdens which rest upon the people. Even the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has adopted it.

Well, the Democratic Party has established a reputation as a burden lifter through tariff legislation. By the Wilson bill it took from the workman the burden of labor and left him free to tramp the road. It took from the manufacturer the burden of keeping his mill in motion, for nobody had money with which to buy his products. It took from the merchant the burden of attending to his business, for it left him no business which needed his attention. It took from the farmer the burden of hauling his crops to market, for it left him no market worth the hauling.

The Democratic Party never has given the country tariff legislation which has not been followed by financial depression and commercial distress. It has never enacted a tariff measure which after six months of trial the people have not clamored to have torn from our statute books. When sufficient time has expired so that a new generation of voters has appeared on the scene and the memory of its former actions has become somewhat faded, then it seeks to beguile the public once more by raising the cry that a tariff for revenue only would benefit the consumer. It may create a wave of discontent upon which it will ride into power, but history will repeat itself and the people, taught again by bitter experience, will return to take up those principles which have given the laborer employment at the highest wages paid anywhere on the broad earth; which have furnished a market for the crops of the farmer and a demand for the products of the manufacturer; which has kept trade and commerce in motion and given a degree of prosperity to this Nation that has never before been equaled. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON].

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, the following official letter was given to the public press by the writer at the same time that it was sent to the recipient. It is deemed perfectly proper that it should be disclosed for the benefit of Congress; therefore I submit it under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, July 30, 1912.

HON. W. C. ADAMSON,
Chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ADAMSON: I have had brought to my attention the report of your committee on the omnibus dam bill (H. R. 25882), in which you discuss my objections to the said bill in its present form. I have also had brought to my attention the debate in the House yesterday on the same subject.

You quite misunderstand my position if you think that the question of the right to obtain compensation for the Federal Government from the grantees of the privileges conveyed by these bills is merely theoretic. On the contrary, it is one of the most practical questions confronting the War Department at the present time. One of the most important engineering projects now confronting the country is the method of improving our navigable rivers by what is known as the "slack-water" method. This method is applicable to a very large number of rivers in this country, which in their natural condition are too swift or too shallow for ordinary commerce. The method consists in building throughout the length of these rivers a series of dams, by which the river is converted into a succession of deep pools adequate for commerce of a far more important character than what could use the river in its unimproved condition. In fact, many rivers which are not capable in their natural state of being used at all commercially can by this method be made useful and available for important commerce.

As you may know, under sanction of Congress this "slack-water" method of improvement is being applied already to very many of our rivers, including the Ohio, the Monongahela, the Muskingum, the Little Kanawha, the Great Kanawha, the Big Sandy, the Kentucky, the Green, and Barren Rivers, and very many others unnecessary now to enumerate. The method, however, is an expensive one, and on account of its cost the Nation has as yet been unable to extend it to countless streams where it would be very useful.

Most of the dams thus constructed in a "slack-water" improvement, particularly in the rapid portions of the streams, will create water power of commercial value. Now, it is manifest that unless the commercial value of the water power thus created can be applied by Congress toward continuing and extending this method of improvement of the stream in question a very much greater financial burden for the improvement of the stream will fall upon the general taxpayers of the country and will therefore necessarily retard and postpone the im-

provement of our rivers for navigation. On the other hand, if Congress avails itself of this asset and applies it to the improvement of the navigation of our rivers the Nation will be very much more speedily placed in the condition of having all of its rivers available for commerce.

Again, as a matter of constitutional law, I can not see that it makes the slightest difference whether the Federal Government builds these dams in the first place at its own expense, thereby, as is generally agreed, obtaining for itself the value of the water power thus created, or whether, assuming that the stream is navigable and the dam an element in the improvement of the stream, the Government chooses to have the dam constructed by a private person as its agent, giving to the private person in return for his action a portion of the value of the water power created. By thus combining the improvement of the river for navigation with the legitimate desire of private parties to develop water power in that neighborhood a great improvement in the navigation of the river can be initiated through this cooperation at a time when otherwise the improvement might be indefinitely delayed. What the Government has the right to do by itself in the interest of navigation it can do through the agency of another.

Now, I am informed by the Chief of Engineers that every one of the rivers included in the omnibus dam bill (H. R. 25882) is susceptible of improvement by the "slack-water" method, and that each of the dams for which the permit is asked will create pools which may be made available for such an improvement. My former recommendations to you, when the bills were first sent me, were intended to bring out this fact. Unless this bill is amended so as to give to the Secretary of War authority to exact proper compensation for the right thus created and to apply it to the future improvement of the navigation of the river by other dams, I do not believe that I have authority under the general dam act to exact such compensation. While its construction is not free from doubt, I believe that the compensation which the general dam act authorizes the Secretary of War to exact would be limited to compensation sufficient to maintain the physical condition of the dam and its locks, and, if necessary, to compel the dam to be torn down or modified should it in future be deemed an obstruction in the river. If you agree with me in the propositions I have heretofore attempted to set out, I think you will agree with me that Congress should not leave the power of the Secretary of War in these premises in any doubt or confusion. In the report of your committee you do not inform me flatly whether your view coincides or differs with mine on this point. You do not, in other words, inform me whether you think that the conditions which the general dam act authorizes me to impose will include compensation of the character which I have outlined above. In the interest of harmonious cooperation by my department with your committee on a subject within our joint jurisdiction and which is of such a great public importance, I should be very glad if you would kindly advise me as to this question.

The development and utilization of these water powers is a most important matter and should not be delayed. The development of the navigability of our rivers for commerce is of equal importance and merits equally prompt treatment. A solution, therefore, which will permit both developments to go hand in hand and by which the interests of the public will be protected and not sacrificed should not be retarded through uncertainty or ambiguity in the phraseology of a statute.

Very respectfully,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

It is equally appropriate that the following official reply to the foregoing letter should be communicated to Congress and to the public, therefore, at the same time that the letter is transmitted to the War Department. I submit it also to the consideration of Congress under the same permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., August 1, 1912.

Hon. H. L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received your communication of the 30th ultimo in relation to certain dam bills now pending. I appreciate the kindly spirit of your letter and assure you that, in common with the committee over which I have the honor to preside, I appreciate your situation and honor your high character and great ability. I would be glad to secure your cooperation in promoting the interests of the people by permitting progress on the projects in question. Your letter presents a singular admixture of correct statement of facts long well known, unwarranted conclusions, and erroneous opinions of both law and fact.

Your apt description of the shoal rivers of the country, the method in vogue to a limited extent of pooling them by dams to permit slack-water navigation, clearly depicts the situation apparent to us all 15 years ago when we undertook the discussion and preparation of a general dam act to serve the double purpose of aiding the Government to hasten the navigation of those streams by consenting for the owners of the shoals and the riparian lands to develop their water power and use it at their own expense. It was estimated that projects had been approved to the amount of about \$400,000,000 to be promoted by the Government at the cost of the Treasury.

There were other streams and parts of streams, however, capable of navigation by the slack-water method where no projects had been approved and where the Government had no purpose of spending any money in the near future. To make these navigable it was estimated would require about \$600,000,000 more. The people who needed the transportation to be afforded by those rivers were dismayed by the remote prospect of improvement by the Federal Government at the rate of progress being made. Nobody believed that the billion dollars necessary to improve all of those streams would be expended by the Government in centuries. It is slow progress being made toward the completion of even the approved projects. Many shoals on the streams where no projects had been undertaken nor even considered by the Government invited the development of valuable water power, which, by the dams constructed, would create ponds or lakes and make navigation of large extent and value. Yet, as the Federal Government asserted jurisdiction over every stream any part of which was nominally navigable, dams could not be built therein without the consent of the Government. Where the Government was willing to incur the expense of the lock and dam, acquiring property rights, and paying for riparian rights, and all other expenses, it would thereby become the property owner as well as the sovereign. As such owner of the premises it would

also own the power generated and could sell or lease it. The former owners having been paid by the Government for the land taken or overflowed by its action, purchase, or condemnation would be satisfied and the consumers of power would be content to lease it from the Government.

The difficulty was the projects were so numerous and expensive that it was and still is impracticable for the Government to construct and operate all those enterprises rapidly enough to promote the interests of the people, the development of the country, and the navigation of the rivers. So the general dam act was formulated, not to operate on Government projects at all, but to permit the owners of shoals and riparian lands to improve the water power on sites where the Federal Government had neither approved nor contemplated any projects on condition that the structures should conform to the direction of and meet the approval of the War Department, so as to foster and promote navigation in harmony with any present ideas on the subject of improving the streams or any plans that might be adopted in the future, to that end even giving way and going out of existence if subsequently plans should be adopted inconsistent with the use of the structure. In that act we did not trench at all upon any enterprise or right of the Government as to any projects or interests of its own, but limited its scope to granting the consent of the Government for property owners to utilize their property which the Government was not ready to take or to use, on condition that in so using their own property the owner should conform to any general plans for the improvement of the stream and help the Government by such structure as would promote navigability, which the Government might not yet be ready to promote at its own expense.

Some of the conditions which the Secretary of War may impose in approving plans are as follows, taken from the general dam act:

"Such dam shall not be built or commenced until the plans and specifications for such dam and all accessory works, together with such drawings of the proposed construction and such map of the proposed location as may be required for a full understanding of the subject, have been submitted to the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers for their approval, nor until they shall have approved such plans and specifications and the location of such dam and accessory works; and when the plans and specifications for any dam to be constructed under the provisions of this act have been approved by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of War it shall not be lawful to deviate from such plans or specifications either before or after completion of the structure unless the modification of such plans or specifications has previously been submitted to and received the approval of the Chief of Engineers and of the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That in approving the plans, specifications, and location for any dam, such conditions and stipulations may be imposed as the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War may deem necessary to protect the present and future interests of the United States, which may include the condition that the persons constructing or maintaining such dam shall construct, maintain, and operate, without expense to the United States, in connection with any dam and accessory or appurtenant works, a lock or locks, booms, sluices, or any other structure or structures which the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers or Congress at any time may deem necessary in the interests of navigation, in accordance with such plans as they may approve, and also that whenever Congress shall authorize the construction of a lock or other structures for navigation purposes in connection with such dam, the persons owning such dam shall convey to the United States, free of cost, title to such land as may be required for such constructions and approaches and shall grant to the United States free water power or power generated from water power for building and operating such constructions: *Provided further*, That in acting upon said plans as aforesaid the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War shall consider the bearing of said structure upon a comprehensive plan for the improvement of the waterway over which it is to be constructed with a view to the promotion of its navigable quality and for the full development of water power; and, as a part of the conditions and stipulations imposed by them, shall provide for improving and developing navigation, and fix such charge or charges for the privilege granted as may be sufficient to restore conditions with respect to navigability as existing at the time such privilege be granted or reimburse the United States for doing the same, and for such additional or further expense as may be incurred by the United States with reference to such project, including the cost of any investigations necessary for approval of plans and of such supervision of construction as may be necessary in the interests of the United States.

"SEC. 2. That the right is hereby reserved to the United States to construct, maintain, and operate, in connection with any dam built in accordance with the provisions of this act, a suitable lock or locks, booms, sluices, or any other structures for navigation purposes, and at all times to control the said dam and the level of the pool caused by said dam to such an extent as may be necessary to provide proper facilities for navigation.

"SEC. 3. That the persons constructing, maintaining, or operating any dam or appurtenant or accessory works, in accordance with the provisions of this act, shall be liable for any damage that may be inflicted thereby upon private property, either by overflow or otherwise. The persons owning or operating any such dam, or accessory works, subject to the provisions of this act, shall maintain, at their own expense, such lights and other signals thereon and such fishways as the Secretary of Commerce and Labor shall prescribe, and for failure so to do in any respect shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to a fine of not less than \$500, and each month of such failure shall constitute a separate offense and subject such persons to additional penalties therefor.

"SEC. 4. That all rights acquired under this act shall cease and be determined if the person, company, or corporation acquiring such rights shall, at any time, fail, after receiving reasonable notice thereof, to comply with any of the provisions and requirements of the act, or with any of the stipulations and conditions that may be prescribed as aforesaid by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, including the payment into the Treasury of the United States of the charges provided for by section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That Congress may revoke any rights conferred in pursuance of this act whenever it is necessary for public use. * * * And provided also, That the authority granted under or in pursuance of the provisions of this act shall terminate at the end of a period not to exceed 50 years from the date of the original approval of the project under this act, unless sooner revoked as herein provided or Congress shall otherwise direct.

"SEC. 7. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved as to any and all dams which may be constructed in accordance with the provisions of this act, and the United States shall incur no liability for the alteration, amendment, or repeal thereof

to the owner or owners or any other persons interested in any dam which shall have been constructed in accordance with its provisions."

Severe pains and penalties follow the disregard of those conditions when imposed or if projects be undertaken before they are imposed. Every interest of the Government is safeguarded if the Secretary of War does his duty in accordance with the provisions of the act. In your former letters you suggested that the pending bill be so amended as to authorize you to regulate the charges and the relations between the power company and the consumers, also to authorize you "to fix a charge for the privilege granted." I respectfully suggest that when the transmission wires cross State lines and the company engages in business between different States there is no doubt that then, and not until then, the right and power of Federal regulation attaches under the commerce clause of the Constitution. Otherwise the Federal Government has no concern with those relations, which are strictly within the jurisdiction reserved exclusively to the States. In every bill reported we have expressly required State action and responsibility as a condition of consent by providing in every instance where the promoters are not already shown to be authorized by the State that the consent shall take effect only when so authorized by the State wherein located.

Your other demand, which seems to be the leading if not the main topic of your last letter, is that the Secretary of War be authorized by amendment of each bill to "charge for the privilege granted," and you ask whether or not that power is clearly conferred upon you by the general dam act. There is no doubt that the act authorizes you "to fix charges for the privileges granted," for it expressly says so.

The difficulty arises from inability to agree as to what constitutes the privilege granted. We believe the consent to be to build a dam on the builder's own land at the builder's own expense and risk, in strict accord with plans and purposes of the Government in order, without expense to the Government, to create slack-water navigation for the Government as complete and satisfactory as if the Government had incurred the expense of several hundred thousand dollars to accomplish the improvement, which, it seems to us, constitutes some compensation for the privilege. The power of control, condemnation, and taxation over the promoters, their customers, and their property, is in the State. I observe that in reporting on two bills proposing dams at one site you insist on the same conditions where a city desired to build a dam for public utility as you sought to impose on a water-power company. It seems to me your argument led you up to a rather strange position when you failed to relax or modify your insistence at that point. The general dam act confers upon you all the powers in respect to fixing compensation that Congress can constitutionally delegate. The difficulty in making progress under the general dam act is not found in peril to the rights of the Government or of the people, but consists in securing or, rather, failing to secure capital available to assume the burdens and risks of operation under the conditions imposed. Capitalists hesitate to operate and build under the hard and possibly unprofitable exactions of the general dam act. Your suggestion of a scheme by which the Government can make the landowner the agent of the Government, gratuitously to build, at his own expense on his own land, a lock and dam which he will operate for the benefit of the Government and under the direction of the Government as to navigation and in addition give to the Government the profits from water power with which the Government may build another dam is a splendid idea if you can find capitalists easy enough to be worked that way, but practical experience fails to find that kind of capitalists.

As to the 10 projects pending, it is indicated by the reports of your engineers that the Government will probably not undertake the improvement of navigation on any of the streams involved for generations to come, but that the prospect of profitable water power may induce capitalists to promote slack-water navigation for the benefit of the Government and the people, under the direction of the Government, if permitted to use the water power developed at their own expense for the benefit of themselves and the people, thereby relieving the people from the oppressive exactions of coal and transportation monopolies.

The only exception among the 10 projects is the one on the site of Lock and Dam No. 18, on the Coosa River, which is one of thirty-odd projects planned by the Government more than a quarter of a century ago. Only three or four of the thirty-odd dams have been constructed on a stream which the expenditure of fifteen or twenty million dollars would convert into the most important domestic waterway in this or any other country, providing cheap transportation for over 900 miles of river through the best country and among the best people the world ever saw. Yet with all the prevalent talk by people who do not correctly apprehend existing conditions, this work of such transcendent importance is held in abeyance, the Government failing to proceed itself and misguided objectors refusing to allow its accomplishment by private capital on terms alike beneficial to the promoters, the Government, and the public. Reporting that project is an exception to our rule and was not originally contemplated by the general dam act, but the Government is not proceeding with it nor with about 30 others on the same stream. In this case capitalists propose to take up the plans of the Government, build the dam and lock as specified by the Government, save the Government all expense, promote the navigation by a long pool of slack water, and comply with any terms the Secretary of War may impose. He has it under the immediate care and supervision of the Board of Engineers, and there is no possibility of loss or injury to anybody if the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers do their duty.

As to these 10 projects, I think you are demanding a great deal, and I trust you will not use your powerful official position and personal influence to obstruct and arrest the universal development of resources promised in these projects for the relief of people all over the country from the clutches of monopoly and trusts to enable them to enjoy prosperity in their day and generation. I know you would not purposely do so, but your views are contrary to the reports of your engineers; they are in conflict with the opinions of lawyers and practical business men everywhere and inimical to the interests of all the people.

Instead of conserving resources, as vainly pretended by some people, those views oppose progress, deny to the people the use of the bounty with which nature has blessed them, and antagonize local authority and responsibility. But you may be right, and we may be wrong, on these propositions. If you think so, please advise those Members of Congress who entertain your views to refrain from obstruction and objections which prevent consideration of those bills. It is impossible to debate or amend them unless their consideration is permitted. Let them withdraw their objections to consideration and then offer on the floor of the House the amendments you suggest. Then the amendments can be debated and voted upon, but not otherwise. That is the only fair and candid course to pursue. If Congress wishes to adopt those amendments, it will certainly be able to do so, regardless of our position, if those who insist on amendment will only be consistent and permit

Congress to consider and vote upon their amendments. Our own view is that even if you are correct in insisting on your amendments, they ought to be placed on the general dam act instead of in each particular bill. We have now taken up again the consideration of amending the general dam act. We think it wise to promote harmony in a general plan by a general act, rather than to make the various individual bills extended and inharmonious codes of contradictory provisions. We shall ask you and all other objectors and critics to furnish us suggestions and drafts of proposed amendments. So anxious are we to permit progress, development, and prosperity among the people that, as far as right and reason may permit, we are willing to yield our views in order to obviate the objections of those persons in and out of official life who obstruct the concurrent development of water power and promotion of navigation, which by fair treatment to property owners and constitutional recognition of local and personal authority and right may be secured without cost to the Government.

There is a great evil connected with the subject never mentioned in the many reformatory suggestions offered. The more drastic the terms of our consent the less able are the ordinary citizens of moderate means to develop their water-power sites, which but for Federal embargo they would be able to improve in a manner commensurate with their financial ability. Unable to hold unremunerative property, they are forced to sell on the best terms obtainable to those who have the money. The purchasers buy up many of these sites, not for the sole purpose of improving them and charging high prices for the power, which seems to be the only thing dreaded by the critics of the general dam act. The States can regulate those charges, and, unhampered by Federal claims, could and would regulate the property rights. The purchasers may sell one at a high price to somebody else to develop and hold the other sites on speculation, or they may, and often do, improve one and hold all the others to prevent their improvement to create competition. That is the most common form of the evil, though if the Government seeks to improve one or more of the sites for navigation it finds the difficulty and expense of condemnation to be prohibitive. Development of water power and navigation is halted by the effective holdup, unless the Government submits to terms which enrich the masters of the situation. The public will welcome a remedy by amendment of the general dam act, the amendment or enforcement of the antitrust act, or by any other method, but all the other suggestions made sink into insignificance in comparison with the trouble herein referred to.

With high regards and best wishes,

Yours, truly,

W. C. ADAMSON, Chairman.

Mr. CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, with mingled feelings of grief and hope I listened this afternoon to the oration of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. I rise to praise it, not to adversely criticize it. This I say because I believe that when the course of an individual or a party has been run, justice, as well as custom, grants to the departed the benediction of a funeral discourse. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, do I, in the name of the admiring and advancing hosts of Democracy, embalm forever in the amber-like history of this day the classical, biblical, tearful, yet hopeful political funeral oration over his party of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. It was an effort worthy of the subject, for notwithstanding all that has been said by its members on this floor of late concerning its most recent performances, the Republican Party will not be denied the tribute of an eloquent and comprehensive funeral farewell. Thanks to the devoted gentleman from Illinois, no facetious Democratic orator can wax dramatic during the campaign and exclaim, as he struts the rostrum describing the Republican Party, with these lines from Shakespeare:

But yesterday the word of Caesar might have stood against the world;
Now lies he there, with none so poor to do him reverence.

How can we ever forget the picture, rhetorical yet melancholy, which the gentleman from Illinois drew of this fair land as he peered into the future and illumined with his imagery the consequences of coming Democratic victory. Piles of twisted machinery here, bleak wastes of abandoned lands over yonder, while from out the debris stand silent and smokeless the chimneys of a million factories. As the orator proceeded with this lugubrious oration methought I saw the ghost of energy and the fitting shade of prosperity dolefully hovering over the country in which they once lived. And then I am sure I heard some wailing voice sobbing in the distance, "Hard times come again no more," while the American people, so industrious, so thrifty, so inventive, so enterprising, and so optimistic under Republican rule, in one horrible resolve dropped all and straightway took to idleness, indifference, and self-inflicted disaster. "Oh my countrymen, what a fall was there."

Then I remembered that for well-nigh two years a Democratic majority has been in control of this branch of the Government, and I wondered how the country had survived through it all, when there came to my mind a brief editorial note in the Republican New York Sun of this morning, as follows:

CHEER UP!

We are not so bad off after all. Here are a few things culled at random from the news in the Sun of yesterday:

Wheat dropped 8 cents a bushel.

The harvests promise to be unusually good.

The price of copper is high.

The coal trade is brisk.

A serious car shortage is promised owing to trade activity and the crops.

Europe owes us a large trade balance.

Congress will adjourn within a month.

And—

It will be lawful to shoot the bull moose full of holes on November 5.

But the gentleman from Illinois left us a few peeping rays of hope. He admitted that even after Democracy had done its worst the sun would still shine, the streams would still flow down to the wider waters, the rain would fall, and the crops would grow. Oh, gracious admission; oh, rainbow of promise, how glorious thou art!

Let no man hereafter say that the gentleman from Illinois is not a progressive Republican, for were he a real standpatter he could not have admitted so much. The standpat prophecies which have made this session of Congress grewsome as well as memorable are all against him, for in those dire forecasts the moon is to lose its mellow light, the sun is to stand still evermore, since it will have nothing worth while to shine upon; crops are to be withered in the blow, and blossoms are to congeal into ice balls in the orchards, while ghastly death wraps all in its smoky mantle, and all on account of Democratic victory.

Surely the admission of the gentleman from Illinois is as a sunbeam through a keyhole to the wretch inside. It is for this reason that I would, if I could, enrich with every gem of literature the funeral oration over the party of the gentleman from Illinois; but the Democracy is already upon us, we hear the rumble of its chariots and discern through lifting mists the splendor of its legions. So we join the gentleman from Illinois and say—

To call the field to rest; and let's away
To part the glories of this happy day.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing a letter addressed to the Secretary of War, and his reply to the same, in regard to a water-power bill I introduced and which was favorably reported upon by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing certain letters. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Following are the letters referred to:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 1, 1912.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am inclosing copy of H. R. 24028, with report upon the same from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This bill, as you will see, provides for the construction of locks and dams on the Clinch River, Tenn. This is a unanimous report, and a measure in which the people I represent are vitally interested.

The survey of the Clinch River was authorized by Congress 12 years ago, and as a result a project was recommended for its improvement for navigation for 75 miles. The project provided for crib dams, to cost \$1,400,000. This would give slack-water navigation all the year round and enable the coal operators of the district to ship coal by water—cheap transportation.

The coal fields of my district are 300 miles nearer New Orleans than the coal fields of western Pennsylvania. We are completely shut out of the New Orleans and lower Mississippi River markets on account of not having the Clinch River improved. Millions of tons of coal are shipped from western Pennsylvania to New Orleans, and not a ton from my district. It costs about a dollar per ton to ship coal from Pennsylvania to New Orleans by water and \$2.25 from my district by rail. As a result, of course we do not sell any coal in New Orleans. If the Clinch River was improved, we would get into this market, and as a result receive our share of the business.

The town in which I live, Knoxville, with a population of over 80,000, and extensively engaged in the manufacturing business, is compelled to pay 50 cents per ton on transportation by rail on steam coal from the mines, 30 miles distant. With the improvement of Clinch River and cheap water navigation we would reduce the cost of this transportation at least one-half.

There are extensive beds of undeveloped iron ore, zinc, and onyx on the Clinch River that could be developed if said river was improved. In addition to the district engineer recommending the improvement of this river, the Board of Army Engineers only recently pronounced it a meritorious proposition, but did not recommend its immediate improvement.

When the project was recommended for the improvement of Clinch River at a cost of \$1,400,000, labor and material was much cheaper than at present.

The Tennessee Hydro-Electric Co., mentioned in the inclosed bill, proposes to build these locks and dams at its own expense, thus relieving the National Government of the expense, etc., of said improvement. Instead of building crib dams, this company would put up concrete dams—more lasting and expensive. This private company would also pay the damages caused from the overflow of farming lands, etc., and maintain, at their expense, the operation of the locks on said river.

Considering the importance of the river and the number of miles to be improved by navigation, I believe this is the best proposition that has been submitted to Congress in the way of compensating the Government for the use of the power to be generated by the construction of locks and dams on a navigable river.

I am endeavoring to pass this bill, and the Speaker has agreed to recognize me to make a motion to suspend the rules and place it upon its passage.

In view of everything that has been published in the press, including a letter that you have only a few days ago written to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I would be pleased to have you write me if, in your judgment, this bill meets with your approval, and if not, kindly point out what changes, in your judgment, should be made.

If you are of the opinion that a certain amount should be paid per horsepower per annum, kindly state said amount, and also if you do not think that the company should be credited with whatever amount your department should find they had expended in providing locks and dams, payment of overflow or damage to property, and annual cost of maintenance and operation of locks.

Thanking you in anticipation,
Respectfully,

R. W. AUSTIN.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, August 1, 1912.

Hon. RICHARD W. AUSTIN,
Representative in Congress, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. AUSTIN: I have your letter of August 1, 1912, and have carefully considered all you say, as well as House Report No. 895, in support of H. R. 24028, authorizing the construction of locks and dams on the Clinch River, Tenn.

As I stated in my letter to Chairman ADAMSON, I believe that one of our great needs is the development of our waterways in the interest of navigation, and this development can be correlated with the much-needed utilization of water-power sites on our navigable streams. Specifically I believe that the public interest will be furthered by the general project on the Clinch River, for the carrying out of which the authority of the Federal Government is sought by H. R. 24028, and I believe that the interests of navigation, the development of commerce, and the fruitful utilization of the water-power sites on the Clinch River can all be reconciled with a proper safeguard of the public interest in the amendments I have heretofore suggested.

Apparently the only difference between the House committee and me is as to the existence of adequate power under the general dam act. To say the least, there is the gravest doubt whether, under the general dam act, I now have the power to exact compensation as one of the conditions for the grant of the privilege, the proceeds of which are to be used in the interest of navigation. If we are agreed that the Secretary of War should have such power, its existence should be put beyond doubt, and there can be no reasonable opposition to the amendment which I suggest. I inclose herewith a draft of the amendment which carries out the suggestions I have made. Of course I believe that a grantee should be credited with all reasonable outlays and contributions in the way of works that relieve the Federal Government from otherwise necessary expenditures. All these and similar considerations are matters for specific adjustment in each case, for, as you will notice, my amendment provides for the fixing of a reasonable charge "under all the circumstances" and for making all due allowances. Undoubtedly proper account should and will be taken for the investment of capital, energy, and enterprise.

As to the second part of the amendment, the committee is of the opinion that the reservation of the right to supervise the price charged to the consumer is sufficiently guarded by the provision reserving the right "to alter, amend, or repeal the act." The reservation of this right to control the charges in nowise involves any presumption that "the several States will be derelict in their responsibility" to the people. There is every reason for presuming the heartiest cooperation between the State and National authorities in the adequate protection of the public in these matters. But the extension of the hydroelectric industry is increasingly becoming an interstate matter, and due provision should be made to guard against the lack of power of the State adequately to control the situation, no less than the exercise of such power as it may have. I, therefore, think that, as a general principle, the reservation of this right to the Federal Government should be made in every bill granting the privilege on a navigable stream. It is true, broadly speaking, that the right to alter or amend carries with it the power to exercise this right in the future. However, I think it is important specifically to reserve this right now, with due notice in advance to all, rather than to unsettle in the future an established situation. Here, again, if the power, as the committee says, is already contained in the general terms of the general dam act, there should be no reasonable objection to its specific expression. This particular amendment embodies in haec verba the amendment introduced by Senator BURTON to the general dam act in his bill S. 6796.

In short, as I have heretofore stated, my amendments merely carry out the carefully considered recommendations of the National Waterways Commission, and spring from the heartiest sympathy with the most effective development of our waterways.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

(Copy of amendment to the omnibus dam bill, H. R. 25882, inclosed in letter dated July 30, 1912, from the Secretary of War to Representative WILLIAM KENT.)

Page 5, at end of line 12, insert the following:

"Provided, That in carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary of War is authorized to require, as one of the conditions and limitations of the privileges herein granted, that the grantee pay periodically to the United States such sums as the Secretary of War may fix as being reasonable under all the circumstances, including due allowance for operating, maintenance, renewal, and depreciation charges, and a reasonable return to the grantee, the proceeds to be used for the development of the stream in respect to which the privilege is granted or waters connected therewith: And provided further, That there is hereby reserved to the Federal Government the right to control the charges for service to the consumers in the event that the law and authority of the State or municipalities where the service is being rendered prove inadequate to protect the public interest."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time has been used?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 37½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Alabama has 1 hour and 29½ minutes remaining.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I do not expect to yield any further time, and there will be one speech in closing, except I may yield to some gentleman for a minute to extend his remarks. I therefore ask the gentleman to use some of his time.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, when I voted for the Payne bill I voted for a bill which in its operation is shown to be lower

in average rates both upon all imports of merchandise and upon dutiable merchandise than the Wilson bill of unfortunate memory. And this illustrates most strikingly the difference between Republican and Democratic tariff bills—the difference between tariff bills framed without regard to their effect upon the industries of the country and without due knowledge and understanding, and bills framed for the purpose of producing sufficient revenue and at the same time keeping the wheels of industry humming and affording abundant opportunities for American labor.

The Republican Party has found that it is possible to maintain prosperous conditions in the country, to keep our mills and factories in operation, under a tariff bill whose average of rates is lower than those of a Democratic tariff bill, under which our industries went into bankruptcy and our people were unable to find employment. We now have before us two bills affecting the cotton industry—a Democratic bill, drawn without regard to its effect upon industries, upon the confession of its authors without regard to them, and a Republican bill, drawn upon full information furnished by the Tariff Board, every item of which has been carefully considered with a view of keeping American mills running and American operatives employed; and yet the Republican bill is lower in its average rates than the Democratic bill. As has been conclusively proven, in my opinion, by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LEXROOT] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], the practical effect of the two bills would be as wide apart as has been the effect of the Payne bill, on the one hand, and as was the effect of the Wilson bill, on the other. High rates are not in all cases essential to due and proper protection, and all that the Republican Party has ever stood for in its policy of protection are rates high enough to enable Americans to compete fairly with their foreign competitors, to keep the mills and the factories open, to keep industries in operation, to keep our people employed at good wages. I shall vote with a great deal of pleasure for the Republican bill affecting the cotton schedule, which is lower, on the average, than the Democratic bill, and yet so drawn as to protect our people, while the Democratic bill would prove destructive to those portions of the cotton industry which depend on skilled labor and particularly the knit-goods industry.

But I did not intend, Mr. Speaker, to discuss at any considerable length the bill now before us, but I propose to discuss in the time at my disposal some of the issues of the coming campaign.

The two great national political parties, each in the midst of storm and stress and contention, have nominated their candidates for the highest office in the gift of the American people. Both of the men nominated are of high character and honest purpose. Neither of them would, if elected, willfully or intentionally do anything or countenance the doing of anything which he did not believe was for the best interest of all our people. Either could be depended upon to so perform the duties of his high office as to safeguard the liberties of the people, and neither would do anything which he believed would directly or remotely change the fundamental character of our political institutions. Mr. Taft and Mr. Wilson are good and able men of wide learning. Both are progressive; neither is revolutionary.

Having said this much of qualities which these two men possess in common, we have reached the point where their marked differences of temperament, of experience, and of political and economic philosophy become apparent. President Taft is a man of the widest and most varied experience. He has been referred to by high authority as the best equipped man ever elected to the Presidency. To great natural ability and broad educational training was added years of experience as a Federal judge, before whose court came some of the most important cases in our legal history, cases involving the fundamental principles of the rights of labor, issues challenging the acts of great combinations of capital, serious problems, of receiverships of railway systems forced into bankruptcy in the dark days of Democratic administration. Judge Taft, blazing the way, upheld the rights of labor, dissolved illegal combinations of capital, and wisely performed his duty in connection with the rehabilitation of the shattered arteries of commerce.

Called to other responsibilities, he proved himself a splendid administrator in the Philippines and an able diplomat and mediator in many difficult situations. His administration of the War Department was in keeping with the splendid record he had made in other fields. In view of all this it was not strange that a President, who generally displayed excellent judgment in calling strong men into his councils, should have approved him as his successor in terms of almost extravagant commendation and praise. Three and a half years as Chief Executive of the Nation has revealed the President to the

American people as the broad-minded widely sympathetic man that he is, free from all bias and prejudice; in active sympathy with, and having a fellow feeling for all classes and conditions of his fellow citizens without regard to race, belief, or condition.

President Taft has not had the knack of appealing, as some others have, to the popular fancy, but he is acknowledged by all to hold the perpetuity of our Government and the welfare of the people above all personal ambition. In the past year a condition has existed on our southern border in Mexico, and recently in Cuba, that might well tempt an ambitious man or even an impulsive one to have taken action which would have plunged the country into war with all its evils, its enormous waste of the people's money, and wanton sacrifice of precious lives. But through it all the President has so guided our affairs as to protect our citizens, preserve the national honor, maintain the respect and confidence of our neighbors and of the world, and save the people from the horrors of bloody conflicts. How different the story might have been, approaching presidential nominations and elections, under a less wise, unselfish, and patriotic leadership.

THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE.

When we turn to the Democratic candidate we see a man whose life has been spent, in the main, among books. We find him displaying to a marked degree that curious lack of appreciation of the actual struggles and problems of the average man, coupled with a cocksureness of opinion relative to practical problems to which he is an absolute stranger, which often characterizes men whose lives are thus spent. Of learning, such as the books give, he has a plenty; of practical experience with the real basic problems of mankind, industrial and political, precious little. He writes well, speaks with fluency, and hence, has written and spoken much; and much it would have been well for his presidential aspirations had he not spoken or written; and yet these utterances before they became tinctured with presidential aspirations, revealed the true spirit of the man. He was a Virginia-born Democrat of the old school, having no sympathy with and little tolerance for either the doctrines or leaderships which new problems and advancing movements in the country developed. His expression of the hope "that some way could be found to knock Mr. Bryan into a cocked hat" like his disapproval of the initiative and referendum and other plans for giving the people a more effective and direct voice and control in the selection of candidates and the enactment of legislation on the ground that "our Government is most safe when least democratic," were characteristic of the man at a time when he felt free to express his real sentiments.

DR. WILSON ON UNION LABOR.

No true friend of labor can read with approval the sentiments which Dr. Wilson expressed in an address at Princeton in June, 1909, as follows:

You know what the usual standard of the employee is in our day. It is to give as little as he may for his wages. Labor is standardized by the trades-union, and this is the standard to which it is made to conform. No one is suffered to do more than the average workman can do. In some trades and handicrafts no one is suffered to do more than the least skillful of his fellows can do within the hours allotted to a day's labor, and no one may work out of hours at all or volunteer anything beyond the minimum. I need not point out how economically disastrous such a regulation of labor is.

It is so unprofitable to the employer that in some trades it will presently not be worth his while to attempt anything at all. He had better stop altogether than operate at an evitable and invariable loss. The labor of America is rapidly becoming unprofitable under its present regulation by those who have determined to reduce it to a minimum.

Our economic supremacy may be lost because the country grows more and more full of unprofitable servants.

Is a man qualified for the great office of the Presidency who holds such an opinion of American labor and of the effect of labor unions? Is he qualified for any position in public life, and how can any friend of labor or unionism support such a man?

HIS VIEW OF IMMIGRANTS.

Several years ago Mr. Wilson wrote what he was pleased to call a "History of the American people." On pages 212 and 213 of volume 5 he makes some observations in regard to immigration and immigrants as follows:

The census of 1890 showed the population of the country increased to 62,622,250, an addition of 12,406,467 within the decade. Immigrants poured steadily in as before, but with an alteration of stock which students of affairs marked with uneasiness. Throughout the country men of the sturdy stock of the north of Europe had made up the main strain of foreign blood, which was every year added to the vital working force of the country, or else of the Latin-Gallic stocks of France and northern Italy; but now there comes multitudes of men of the lowest class from the south of Italy and men of a meaner sort out of Hungary and Poland, men out of the ranks where there was neither skill nor energy nor any initiative of quick intelligence; and they came in numbers which increased from year to year, as if the countries from the south of Europe were disburdening themselves of the more sordid and hapless elements of their population, whose standards of life and of work were

such as American workmen had never dreamed of hitherto. The people of the Pacific coast have clamored these many years against the admission of immigrants out of China, and in May, 1892, got at last what they wanted, a Federal statute which practically excluded from the United States all Chinese who had not already acquired the right of residence, and yet the Chinese were more to be desired as workmen, if not as citizens, than most of the coarse crew that came crowding in every year at the eastern ports. They had, no doubt, many an unsavory habit, bred in unwholesome squalor in the crowded quarters where they most abounded in the western seaports, and seemed separated by their very nature from the people among whom they had come to live; but it was their skill, their intelligence, their hardy power of labor, their knack of succeeding and driving their duller rivals out, rather than their alien habits, that made them feared and hated and led to their exclusion at the prayer of the men they were likely to displace should they multiply. The unlikely fellows who came in at the eastern ports were tolerated because they usurped no place but the very lowest in the scale of labor.

HE PREFERS CHINESE TO EUROPEANS.

What do the people who have come to us from Poland and Hungary and southern Italy and all south and southwest Europe think of a man holding such views as these as a candidate for the highest office in the land? What does any thoughtful citizen think of one so woefully lacking in appreciation of the fundamental requisites for useful citizenship in a free Republic?

Dr. Wilson assails the people from Poland, "the fair land of Poland," which gave us in our struggle for independence the brave and dashing Pulaski, whose gallant figure adorns the splendid avenue leading from this Capitol, and many other brave soldiers; Poland with her marvelous and soul-stirring history of brave struggles for freedom and the rights of man. Dr. Wilson scorns the people from Hungary; brave, picturesque, romantic Hungary, which contributed to our Revolutionary struggle the able and heroic Kosciuszko, whose noble monument holds an honored place in front of the presidential mansion, to which Dr. Wilson aspires; Hungary, whose people unaided turned back the tide of Moslem invasion and saved Christian Europe from the awful domination of the unspeakable Turk. Italy, Greece, Servia, Austria, glorious in history, exalted in aspiration, holding the faith of the true God and acknowledging responsibility to Him, all these and others like them are, in the opinion of the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, less desirable as citizens of this Republic than the pagan Chinese.

THE PLATFORMS.

Passing from the candidates to the platforms of the two parties and viewing these platforms in the light of our recent legislative experience, we find an even wider difference than that shown by the candidates themselves. Our Democratic friends have in this campaign announced their choice of a battle ground, and fortunately for the Republicans the gauge of battle is thrown down in a field in which our party has been uniformly victorious, once the situation was clearly outlined before the people. The issue could not have been more clearly defined. The Republican Party reaffirms its belief in a protective tariff, and holds that import duties should be high enough, while yielding a sufficient revenue, to protect adequately American industries and wages, and to the end that tariffs may be wisely adjusted along these lines the party declares that it is favorable to securing, through a tariff board or otherwise, the information requisite for intelligent tariff legislation. A declaration in keeping with the fundamental and time-honored principles of the party and yet progressive in the highest degree in its declaration for scientific schedules based on the most complete information.

On the other hand, the Democratic Party in its tariff declaration harks back to the nullification doctrines of Calhoun and to the principles enunciated in the constitution of the late Confederacy. Calhoun proposed to nullify a protective law passed by Congress on the theory that Congress had no right or authority to pass such a law. If old Andrew Jackson were alive now and still a Democrat, instead of threatening to hang Calhoun higher than Hamen he would have to apologize to him, for the party that still claims to be the party of Jackson at Baltimore the other day declared it to be—

A fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government, under the Constitution, has no right or power to impose or collect tariff taxes except for the purpose of revenue.

But although the Democracy harks back to nullification days for its tariff policy it can lay claim to a more recent indorsement of it, for we find that the constitution of the late Confederacy was also true to Calhoun's doctrine and declared—nor shall any duties nor taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry—

from all of which it would seem that the principle they now announce has good Democratic authority behind it.

The issue is thus fairly joined between Republican protection and Democratic free trade, for there is no difference, so far as the effect on industries is concerned, between a tariff for

revenue and free trade. Both mean that the necessary revenue shall be obtained in such way as will not encourage or promote industries by protecting them.

TARIFF AN ISSUE.

There are many reasons why the tariff issue is one that will not down so long as any party in this country challenges the correctness of the policy of protection, for, after all is said and done, the most persistent and insistent issue in this world revolves around the questions of *what we shall eat and drink and wherewithal we shall be clothed*. There are many questions of method and procedure in government which, while important, the people will temporarily put aside in the presence of an attack upon the sources and the foundation of their opportunities for a livelihood, and that is exactly the situation which now confronts us. There need be no lack of interest in the questions of methods and procedure in our Government which have so largely occupied the public mind for the last three or four years, but the people will not allow them to obscure or displace the issue of prosperity.

Not only does the Democratic platform stand for free trade, but the Democratic candidate has always been a free trader rather from theory than from knowledge, as was curiously illustrated on one occasion when he appeared before a tariff board. He contended that we could compete with foreign countries in wages without protection "just as we do in regard to agricultural products," which, he said, came in free. Having had his attention called to the fact that there was a duty on agricultural products, amounting in the case of wheat to 20 cents a bushel, he said, "then I was misinformed"; but he went right on with his argument just the same. *Facts are never allowed to interfere with the theories of a free trader*. We have many statements of his, made at one time and another on the subject, and to complete the picture we have a Democratic leadership in Mr. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, avowedly free trade, apologizing for bringing legislation into the House because it contained some little ray of protective legislation, and explaining that nothing of the kind would be allowed to occur unless the revenue which the slightly protective duty raised were needed.

DEMOCRATIC TARIFF LEGISLATION.

We have witnessed the procession through the House in the last year of five Democratic tariff bills. Nothing has pleased the authors of these bills so much as their failure to become laws. Were they now all on the statute books their calamitous effect upon the industries and the welfare of the people would have destroyed every ray or vestige of hope of the Democratic Party for success this fall. If it were not for the awful responsibility involved in bringing disaster upon the people, the Republicans might have been tempted to allow these bills to become laws as an object lesson of the destructive character of Democratic tariff legislation.

Each one of these bills would in turn have destroyed great industries and impoverished multitudes of people. The *free sugar bill* would have impoverished the farmers and manufacturers alike, in the beet and cane districts of the country, and would have bankrupted the Treasury. The *House wool bill* would have been a *death blow* to the great American wool and woolen industries, while the cotton, the chemical, the steel, and the so-called free-list bills would have each furnished its quota of *bankruptcy, idleness, hunger, and despair*. Together they would have created a condition as *disastrous* as that which existed under the *Wilson bill*; and all this loss and poverty and ruin would have had no recompense in better conditions for any class of American citizens *except loan sharks and auctioneers*.

What makes me confident that the people will rise in defense of the Republican Party and protection and prosperity is the fact that in the midst of these threats, bluffs, and fourflushings by the Democratic Party the industries of the country have continued reasonably prosperous and labor quite steadily employed. It must be because the people realize that they propose to smite the free-trade policy when they get a chance this fall.

We realize that some schedules are unnecessarily high, and our party stands pledged to a reasonable reduction of such schedules. That the schedules of the present tariff are, however, in the main, low compared with former tariffs is abundantly demonstrated by the figures of imports. All sorts of lies were told about the Payne tariff bill when it passed. Never in the history of the country was there so much misstatement and downright lying about a tariff bill as there was about the Payne bill, and unfortunately the people largely believed them.

PAYNE TARIFF LAW.

We have passed from the day of prophecy and prevarication to the time when we have the actual facts and figures about the Payne bill. They show on the basis of imports of merchandise

During the 34 months that the Payne tariff law had been in operation down to May 31, 1912, the following results compared with the operation of the Wilson Democratic and Dingley Republican tariffs, respectively: First, that the free list under the Payne law—that is, the amount of goods imported without paying any duty—was a considerably larger percentage of the total of importations than under either the Wilson or the Dingley bills; second, that the average amount of duties paid per dollar of dutiable imports was very considerably lower under the Payne bill than under the other two laws; and that the same was true with regard to the entire volume of our importations. It sometimes takes the truth a long time to catch up with a lie well told and persistently reiterated, and it never can undo the harm the lie has accomplished, but the facts I have stated, taken from the record, give the lie direct to perhaps the most persistent falsehoods ever uttered in American political history. Not only was the Payne bill a revision downward of the Dingley law, but its average rates are demonstrated by the table which

I shall place in the Record to be lower than those of the Wilson bill of mournful memory. Was a Republican President far from right in saying that the Payne tariff law was the best we ever had, in view of the fact that, with a larger free list than the Wilson law, with lower average ad valorem rates than that law, both as to the dutiable list alone and as to all imports, it has produced an abundance of revenue, placed a surplus in the Treasury, and promoted prosperity in the face of persistent agitation and calamity howling, while under the Wilson bill the Treasury was empty, industry was paralyzed, and the people were in despair. I can imagine no more striking comparison between Democratic and Republican legislation than this, between a crude unbalanced Democratic law which did not produce sufficient public revenue and did paralyze private industry, and a carefully drawn Republican bill with lower average rates, which does produce abundant revenue and at the same time promotes the prosperity of the people. The following is the table I have referred to:

Imports of merchandise into the United States, showing percentage thereof free of duty, customs receipts, and average ad valorem rate of duty during the 34 months' operation of the Payne tariff law, Aug. 5, 1909, to May 31, 1912, compared with like results under the entire operation of the Wilson and Dingley tariffs, respectively.

Entire period of—	Imports.			Free.	Customs receipts.	Average ad valorem on—	
	Free.	Dutiable.	Total.			Dutiable.	Total imports.
	Millions.	Millions.	Millions.	Per cent.	Millions.	Per cent.	Per cent.
Wilson law:							
35 months ¹	\$1,080.4	\$1,132.7	\$2,213.1	48.8	\$485.0	42.8	21.9
Monthly average.....	30.9	32.4	63.3		13.9		
Dingley law:							
144 months ²	5,428.5	6,821.5	12,250.0	44.3	3,121.8	45.8	25.5
Monthly average.....	37.7	47.4	85.1		21.7		
Payne law:							
34 months ³	2,301.4	2,192.4	4,493.8	51.2	902.6	41.2	20.1
Monthly average.....	67.7	64.5	132.2		26.5		

¹ Excludes last 4 days of August, 1894, included under McKinley law, and includes July 24-31, 1897, under act of 1897.

² Excludes last 8 days of July, 1897, included under Wilson law; excludes Aug. 1-5, 1909, included under Payne law.

³ Includes Aug. 1-5, 1909, under act of 1897.

NOTE.—A reduction of about \$55,000,000 was caused in customs receipts under the McKinley Act, due to reduced imports in the closing months under that act in anticipation of the passage of the Wilson tariff, whose revenues were correspondingly increased. Likewise a reduction of about \$45,000,000 was caused in customs receipts under the Dingley Act, due to heavy imports in the closing months under the Wilson law, whose revenues were correspondingly increased.

THE TARIFF ISSUE IN WYOMING.

The people whom I have the honor to represent, though they are not a manufacturing people, are as dependent on a protective tariff for the prosperity of their industries as any people under the flag. We have approximately a tenth of all of the sheep in the Union. Not only are a large number of our people directly interested in the industry, but a still larger number are directly and indirectly benefited by the millions of dollars of annual expenditure in the industry. The dependence of our wool industry upon the tariff is so well known and understood, so universally acknowledged, even by those who do not favor a protective tariff, as to make argument on the subject superfluous. We have a great cattle industry protected, on the one hand, from importations of cheap cattle from Mexico and, on the other hand, from meats from Australia and the Argentine.

The farmers along our northern border are vehement in their opposition to Canadian reciprocity, on the ground that it would bring them into competition with the cheap products of Canada. We share in that opposition, but Wyoming would suffer infinitely more under free trade in coal than she would from Canadian reciprocity, which did not propose free coal. Several of our great coal mines must find a large part of the market for their products in competition with Canadian coals of as good or better quality, more cheaply mined, and with a shorter and cheaper freight haul. It has been estimated that free trade in coal would result in our losing a third of our present market, with its consequent disastrous effect upon the industry and wages.

We have in various parts of Wyoming, notably in the Big Horn Basin, the Wind River Valley, Sheridan and Johnson Counties, and on the Platt and its tributaries, large areas of land suitable for the growth of sugar beets. After years of waiting for transportation facilities, for the completion of reclamation enterprises, and after thorough experimentation and practical demonstration in the growing of beets, we had finally reached the time when, but for Democratic agitation of the sugar tariff, our hope of the establishment of sugar factories was about to be realized. Speaking with knowledge of the situation, I can say with assurance that but for the Democratic free-sugar bill this year at least two beet-sugar factories would have been under way in Wyoming at this time. With the election of a Republican President and Congress there is no reason why Wyoming should not have as many beet-sugar factories as Colorado, which has 17, in the next five years.

Elect a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President and our hope of sugar-beet factories goes glimmering forever.

Wyoming is becoming a great alfalfa State, and this great staple product depends for its market upon the great live-stock business, and so the success of the alfalfa farms and ranches is in a large measure dependent upon the protective policy.

Flax is destined to become one of our staple products; the Democratic Party proposes to put flaxseed, which now has a protection of 25 cents a bushel, on the free list. Potato culture, in a large way for the eastern market, presents a promising and profitable field for the enlargement of our agricultural output on both our irrigated and dry lands. Democratic free trade proposes to deprive us of the protection without which our eastern markets can be flooded with foreign potatoes, paying only a low water freight rate.

The railroads of the State, so far as their local business is concerned, can not be prosperous without the prosperity of these local industries which depend upon protection. Even our through railroad business is largely in products of the coast to the East and in manufacture from the East to the West which would be displaced by foreign products and manufactures under free trade; therefore the men on the railroads of the State are as much interested as any class of our people in the continuation of protection.

TRUE ECONOMY.

Our Government makes larger annual expenditures than any National Government in the world; it is also the most honestly administered Government in the world, and our people do not begrudge the vast annual outlay made by the Government for their protection and benefit, so long as it is honestly and economically expended. There is, however, a tendency toward unnecessary expenditure which must be constantly guarded against. With President Roosevelt's liberal views of the legitimate and useful fields of national activity and his intolerance of delay in carrying out any work or enterprise he believed should be undertaken, he could not have been expected to promote or practice economy in national outlay. In fact expenditures increased so rapidly during his administration that ordinary outlay finally outran ordinary income to the amount of over \$65,000,000 in the last two years of his administration. This condition inherited by President Taft laid upon him the hard and thankless task of holding down constantly mounting appropriations without crippling or hampering the really useful and helpful expenditures of the Government.

He took hold of the matter with judgment and determination and to such good purpose that while the ordinary outlay of the Government under President Roosevelt had increased \$41,000,000 in the fiscal year 1909 over the expenditures in 1908, the expenditures in 1910, the first full year of President Taft's administration, was over three millions less than the year previous, and though the country is growing rapidly and the demand for national expenditures have constantly increased, our ordinary national outlay for each of the fiscal years 1911 and 1912 has been kept below that of 1909 by several million dollars.

Not only this, but the much abused Payne tariff law has proven such a good revenue producer that our ordinary revenues were in the fiscal year 1912 over \$90,000,000 more than under the Dingley law in 1909. In 1909 the ordinary receipts were more than fifty-eight millions less than the ordinary disbursements. In 1912 our ordinary income was over \$37,000,000 more than our ordinary outlay. This is a record of real economy without injury to the public service.

FALSE ECONOMY.

This Democratic House of Representatives has given us a brilliant example of fake economy. Starting out with a widely advertised plan to economize in the administration of the House, the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have promoted a series of largely useless and unnecessary investigations which have, and will, cost more than all the much advertised economies saved.

At various times during the discussion of appropriation bills I have called to the attention of the House the farce comedy you gentlemen are treating the country to in connection with appropriations. By your own confessions, in many large and important items, you are only appropriating for 8 months instead of 12. You have provided for practically no new projects or expenditures, and in many cases have turned down estimates made by the Government departments for needed repairs and replacements.

Your Army bill prohibited any expenditures for necessary repairs and improvements to our western Army posts. The sundry civil bill did not provide adequately for the ordinary necessary care of public buildings. You turned a deaf ear to our urgent demand for sufficient money to make necessary surveys of public lands, and denied the request of the Forest Service for sufficient sums to build roads and bridges and trails in the forest reserves. All this was done in the name of economy, and yet you appropriated millions for wholly useless and valueless fortifications on the Panama Canal.

Fortunately the Appropriation Committee at the other end of the Capitol has taken a different view of the needs of the public service, and your policy has driven Members of the House to appeal to the Senate for consideration of items of appropriation essential for the Government service and to meet the just obligations of the Nation. I realize that this fake showing of economy is considered necessary to the success of the Democratic ticket in the coming campaign, but I doubt if it will be effective. The people of the country are neither blind nor foolish.

I do not think the gentlemen on the other side are very proud of, or happy over, the results of the numberless investigations that have been instituted and carried on. No wicked or idle tale prompted by self-interest, envy, or malice, has been too remote from the jurisdiction of the investigation committees, or too frivolous to escape investigation, and yet how miserably meager the harvest of results has been. I said I did not think our Democratic friends were proud or happy over the results of these investigations, and yet, as patriotic citizens, they should be, for they have proven, as perhaps no other means could have done, how free from wrong-doing and how little subject to criticism the administration of the vast volume of our public affairs has been under a party that has been in control of all branches of the Government for 15 years. That ought to be a matter of pride to any American citizen.

PARTY ACHIEVEMENT.

The Republican Party to-day, as always, points with pride to its record of achievement and looks forward with hope and confidence to the future. As has been well stated in our platform:

The Republican Party looks back upon its record with pride and satisfaction, and forward to its new responsibilities with hope and confidence. Its achievements in government constitute the most luminous pages in our history. Our greatest national advance has been made during the years of its ascendancy in public affairs. It has been genuinely and always a party of progress; it has never been either stationary or reactionary; it has gone from the fulfillment of one great pledge to the fulfillment of another in response to the public need and to the popular will.

Referring first to our latest party achievements under the present administration, we can point with pride to the establish-

ment of postal-savings banks; of the Bureau of Mines, which has been so useful and helpful to our miners; to the Children's Bureau; to the legislation for the suppressing of the white-slave traffic; to the enactment and enforcement of the pure-food law; to the increase of pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Civil War; to the bringing into the Union of the Commonwealths of Arizona and New Mexico.

In that class of legislation which so vitally affects the citizen in his rights and property under present industrial conditions—legislation to control great combinations of capital and to prevent monopoly and restraint of trade, and legislation regulating railways and other means of transportation—the party has been faithful, wise, and progressive. All of the laws for the suppression of monopoly and for the control of railways have been placed upon the statute books by Republicans, and generally in the face of Democratic opposition. The antitrust act of 1890; the interstate-commerce act of 1887 and its important amendments, giving ample powers to the Interstate Commerce Commission; the so-called 16-hour law, limiting the hours of employment of those engaged in train service; the prohibition of free passes, all are Republican legislation enforced by a Republican Executive.

COMBINATIONS OF CAPITAL.

The antitrust act of 1890 remained a dead letter under the Democratic Cleveland administration except for its enforcement against a labor organization. The McKinley administration was the first to energetically enforce the statute, and prosecutions were continued under Roosevelt; but it remained for the present administration to make the statute a vital force in the breaking up and prevention of monopoly. The decisions in the Tobacco and Standard Oil cases, the prosecution of the Beef Trust, the pending suits against the Steel and Harvester Trusts, have finally put the terror of the law in the hearts of trust magnates.

Possibly it is not to be wondered at that in their wrath and resentment against the administration which is making them answer for their crimes against the American people, the men at the head of these trusts, like Mr. Perkins, should be giving their millions and their influence to a movement through which they hope to defeat President Taft for reelection. Certain false friends of the people have sought to detract from the credit due the administration for its trust prosecutions by claiming that the outcome of these successful suits would not be effective in the suppression of monopoly. The rage of the trust magnates, their flocking to the standard of a proposed new party, their millions contributed to defeat Taft and wreck the Republican Party, are the best answers to such a claim.

In Wyoming we happen to know of the potent and beneficial effect of the Standard Oil decision. Every man interested in the development of the great oil resources of our State can tell of the changed conditions since the Standard Oil decision. It is as though an atmosphere charged with storm, laden with threatenings, and burdened with gloom had been suddenly, as by magic, cleared and purified; no longer the haunting fears of a subtle power liable to manifest itself in any one or all of a hundred ways to baffle, thwart, and defeat effort and endeavor, but a universally recognized opportunity to develop and do business. *And yet there are sinister influences in the name of virtue and under the guise of reform which would rob the people of the victories they have won under this republican administration.*

TAFT THE ANTITRUST CANDIDATE.

Leaving out of consideration our friends the Socialists and the Prohibitionists, who base their campaigns on other issues, the only candidate who will be before the American people this fall who is entirely free from all association or alliance, direct or indirect, with the trusts is William Howard Taft. We all recall how Prof. Wilson's candidacy for the Presidency was launched. George Harvey, of Harper's Weekly, friend and confidant of J. Pierpont Morgan, brought him out and widely advertised his candidacy. It is true that after Prof. Wilson had profited mightily by Harvey's support he displayed the basest ingratitude toward him and declined his further open support, but that does not alter the fact that great trust magnates like the Belmonts and Ryans are supporting the Democratic candidate.

Mr. Bryan's sensational desertion of CHAMP CLARK, who was the people's candidate, in the Baltimore convention and his support of Mr. Wilson has had the effect of making the people temporarily forget the origin and source of Mr. Wilson's real strength. It is, and always has been, largely among the friends, sympathizers, and supporters of the great financial magnates of the country. Tammany did not vote for Wilson, because Tammany is wise in not showing its hand; but all of the elements in New York that are for Wilson most heartily, Tammany included,

are in sympathy with the objects and purposes of those controlling great trusts.

THE THIRD PARTY AND THE TRUSTS.

The close commune between the third-term party candidate and the third-term party organization and the trusts is so notorious as to make extended argument or elaboration superfluous. Mr. Perkins, late partner of J. Pierpont Morgan, who wants the Federal Government to issue licenses to the trusts to plunder the people, and others like him, have from the beginning been the promoters, supporters, and underwriters of the third-term party movement. The Steel and Harvester Trusts particularly are so notoriously supporting the third-term party movement, and the movement is so universally acknowledged to have an abundance of funds from these sources at its command that further comment is unnecessary.

PRESIDENT TAFT AND THE TRUSTS.

The Republican Party, under President Taft, could have no alliance or affiliation with great trusts or combinations of capital, seeking to unlawfully restrain trade and create and establish monopolies, if it wanted to, and they certainly do not want to. The administration of President Taft has so continuously, forcefully, and successfully prosecuted combinations of capital in restraint of trade that in their fury they rush to the support of the Democratic nominee or the third-term party candidate, whichever seems to them to hold out the best promise of defeating the Republican Party and President Taft. Every resource of money and influence will be used directly and indirectly to defeat the President for reelection, and it is difficult at this time to say in which direction the greatest efforts will be made to accomplish this purpose, whether through the Democratic or the third-term party.

It ought to be clear to the dullest understanding that the only hope of the people in their battle for the suppression of monopoly is in the support of the party and the candidate which has been and is at this time vigorously enforcing the law against illegal combinations. It ought to be equally clear that the Democratic candidate and party are not and can not be clear from alliances with great corporate wealth, and certainly no one can be so poorly informed as not to know that the third-term candidate and his organization has as its principal prop and support the officers, the beneficiaries, and the friends of great trusts and combinations seeking to monopolize the industries of the country.

REGULATION OF RAILWAYS.

The Interstate Commerce Commission was established by the Republican Party in 1887. It was strengthened and made a really vital force by successive amendments developed in the school of experience, but it never really found itself and became the vital efficient force for good it was intended to be until the present administration. *No administrative bureau ever erected has so universally commended itself to public sentiment as the Interstate Commerce Commission under the administration of William Howard Taft.*

It has been impossible, in view of the magnitude of the problem, for the commission to give attention to and adjust all of the manifold problems arising in connection with our enormous system of interstate transportation, but it has passed upon and wisely adjusted many of the larger and controlling problems. It stood like a wall of adamant against a demand by all of the railways for a general increase of rates. It has cured and prepared the way for the further curing of oppressive rates affecting vast tonnages in the intermountain and western States by the decisions in the so-called *Spokane case*, the *Salt Lake case*, and the *cases affecting wool rates*. The recent order of the commission reducing express rates from 15 to 50 per cent will be of great and lasting benefit to the people, and is only the beginning of the regulation and reduction of express rates.

THE MEAT PACKERS.

One of the important problems in this connection is that of bringing the retail price which the people must pay for meats in reasonable harmony with the price which the stock grower receives for his product. The cost of meat production, owing to the breaking up of the ranges into farms and the better price which the farmer receives and should receive for corn and hay, has largely increased. Yet there is a well-founded belief that the great packers so manipulate the prices they pay for live stock and charge for meat as to secure an inordinate profit at both ends of their business. The peculiar practices and methods of the packers have made it exceedingly difficult for the Government to prove to the satisfaction of a jury that the packers have been guilty of violating the criminal provisions of the antitrust laws.

The packers, like some other large combinations, in view of the known determination of the administration to put an end to

their monopolistic practices, have in contemplation dissolution of the great holding combination known as the National Packing Co., and there is hope, if the people do not unwisely desert the administration which has fought their battles, for permanent relief from the exactions of the great packers.

The facts that President Taft's administration has developed and the reforms it has accomplished in reducing the powers of the packers are an illuminating commentary on that famous report made by former Commissioner of Corporations and Secretary of the Interior Garfield, under President Roosevelt, to his chief, in which he consumed several months of time, spent a large amount of Government money, and spoiled several hundred pages of good white paper in a labored effort to prove that the packers were a much-abused band of philanthropists, working overtime for the benefit of the people and getting only a measly 3½ per cent on their investment for their trouble.

Mr. Garfield, like his successor as Chief of the Bureau of Corporations, Mr. Herbert Knox Smith, appointed by Mr. Roosevelt, who likewise gave Mr. Perkins's Harvester Trust a good name and a clean bill of health to his chief, is now and has been one of the supporters of the third-party movement. *These two patriots can not tolerate a party and an administration which is so inconsiderate as to prosecute the trusts they particularly favor.*

THE MEAT PROBLEM.

It is my opinion that we shall not reach a really satisfactory condition in regard to our meat supply until, by the more general distribution of slaughtering establishments, large and small, we shall insure more real competition in the purchase of sheep and cattle for slaughter, and hence a better price to the stock raiser. Such a policy, by bringing the producer of meats nearer the consumer and preventing monopoly, will also give the consumer relief from exorbitant prices.

One obstacle in the way of such a distribution of packing establishments in the past has been the difficulty of securing satisfactory railroad rates. I have already pointed out how, under our efficient Interstate Commerce Commission, reasonable rates can now be secured. The commission now has such complete knowledge of the situation as will render speedy adjustment of other unfair and unjust rates possible and certain, and yet all has been done and will be done for the relief of the people, in full recognition of the rights of the common carriers to fair compensation, to the end that investments in railroads shall not be jeopardized or discouraged and that the roads may be able to pay liberal compensation to their employees.

THE PARTY OF PROGRESS.

The Republican Party has always been and is to-day the party of real and not sham progress and progressiveness—ever alert and responsive to the necessity and demand for progressive legislation which shall apply the principles of justice, equity, and righteousness to the constantly changing problems confronting a mighty people under a free government. We recognize that great as the achievements of the past have been, there always will be new problems, to be met in the spirit of fairness and to be settled in accordance with the principles of justice in the interest of all the people.

We are pledged to an unceasing warfare against monopoly and privilege and to such additional legislation as may be necessary to make clear the line of demarcation between the opportunities for the fair rewards, due real service rendered by individuals or corporations, and the practices which seek the amassing of great fortunes through methods of industrial piracy and monopoly.

We stand pledged to a supreme effort along all lines to reduce, as far as possible, the gap between the fair prices and rewards to which the producer on the farm, or the ranch, and in the workshop receives for the product of his labor, his genius, and his energy, and the price which the ultimate consumer must pay for these products. We stand pledged to legislation calculated to increase the attractiveness and the rewards of life upon the farms and ranches of the Nation. That life which has and always will develop the highest and best class of citizenship; those industries upon which the feeding and the clothing of the Nation primarily depend. To this end we favor the establishment of a parcel post which shall be just to all; the encouragement of better agricultural loan facilities; the betterment of conditions of inland transportation.

IN THE INTEREST OF LABOR.

We stand as we always have stood, pledged and dedicated to the highest and best interests of labor; to a protective tariff which will maintain the American wage rate and the American standard of living. We favor legislation which will lift from the shoulders of widows and orphans, so far as financial compensation can do it, the want and misery entailed by the loss or injury in industrial pursuits of their natural supporters and protectors.

It is intolerable to the sense of justice that the burdens of the inevitable casualties connected with industries, beneficial to all of the people, should be laid upon the *bereaved and helpless*. To be truly helpful the response and compensation should be *swift, certain, and adequate*.

To all good citizens it is axiomatic that those engaged in labor, like all classes of our citizens, should be established, confirmed, and protected in all their rights. I always have and always will favor and support legislation to accomplish that purpose. My youth and early manhood was spent among and sharing the burdens of those who toil. I have felt the pinch and grip of poverty, and I have also felt the wholesome satisfaction that comes from a hard day's work honestly performed. I could not be lacking in knowledge of and sympathy with the problems and aspirations of labor unless I forgot my own experience. I could not fail to appreciate and proclaim the honor and dignity of labor without surrendering the just pride I have in my own record.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WEST.

In the face of a prejudiced and misguided sentiment, fostered largely by men with selfish personal ambitions, it has not been possible to secure all of the legislation needed for the speedy settlement and orderly development of the public domain; but the Republican Party, author of the homestead policy, has, as an organization, been true to its historic policy, and much has been accomplished in the face of difficulties. Following the national reclamation law has come the enlarged homestead act and the act for the agricultural entry of coal land. Quite recently the three-year homestead law was enacted. Thanks to earnest and determined effort, this law was secured free from the limitations which the extreme conservationists would have put upon it, and carrying the highly beneficial provision for an annual leave of absence. These and a number of minor but helpful provisions of law have marked the progress of the orderly evolution of the Republican homestead policy.

The opposition of certain extremists, now largely marshaling themselves under a third party banner, has prevented other needed legislation to make possible the more advantageous use and development, in the interest of all of the people and without monopoly, of some of our mineral resources and of those portions of the public domain which are more suitable for grazing than for farming. But with the triumph of the Republican Party and its freedom from certain influences which now seem to be seeking their purposes through another organization, we may confidently hope and expect additional legislation and such reasonable administration as will relieve the West from the handicap of those policies which, under the false claim of serving the people, have been oppressive in their effect upon individuals honestly seeking homes and opportunities on the public domain and retarding in their effect upon general development.

THIRD PARTY MOVEMENT.

The Republican Party for the third time in its history is confronted with a serious defection in its ranks. Those who are old enough will remember the abuse heaped upon the immortal Lincoln by members of his own party when he was a candidate for reelection. They will recall now the reelection of the great emancipator, which we now know to have been essential to the integrity and prosperity of the Nation, was for months after his nomination despaired of. The differences then developed led to the nomination of Horace Greeley by the Liberal Republicans in 1872; and up to within a month of the date of election that movement gave every promise of sweeping the country and defeating Grant. It is not so far back to the Silver Republican bolt of 1896, when those who adhered to the party and particularly in the West, were denounced as hirelings of Wall Street and enemies of mankind; and many remember the certain and cocksure predictions up to the very day of election of the defeat of McKinley; and so to-day we are confronted with a breach in the party lines and the promise of an independent nomination.

No citizen under a free government is justified in abusing men for honest differences of political views. Members of any political party have a perfect right, for proper reasons, either to support the candidates of another party, or, if they see fit, ally themselves with a separate and independent organization. On the other hand, all good citizens have a right, and it is their duty, to calmly, dispassionately inquire into the motives which actuate such conduct and to insist upon truth of statement relative thereto and that honesty of purpose and real, and not false or merely fanciful, reasons shall constitute the motive or the excuse for such action.

THE PRECONVENTION CAMPAIGN.

In the campaign preceding the Republican national convention there was a wide difference of opinion, as there generally

is, relative to the choice of candidates. Some of the active supporters of a certain candidate frankly admit that for what they were pleased to term "psychological reasons" they instituted a large number of fictitious contests, many of them long after delegates had been elected without opposition, and thereupon presumably for the same "psychological reasons" started a nation-wide campaign of accusation and abuse, continuing it on down during and subsequent to the national convention in ever-increasing violence and volume.

There was no single note of moderation in all this torrent of abuse and villification. The national committee, containing many friends and supporters of the candidate who had been most emphatic and vehement and abusive in the claim that delegates and delegations had been stolen, by their unanimous vote in a considerable majority of the contests—and in many cases where the claims of fraud had been the most positive, emphatic, and violent—declared against the delegates pledged for him. Even then the charges of fraud were in no particular or in the slightest degree modified or withdrawn; on the contrary, each succeeding unanimous judgment of the national committee against delegates and delegations which had been claimed by and for Mr. Roosevelt but led to a fresh outburst of extravagant claims, astounding charges, and unmeasured abuse.

Evidently somebody was wrong. Either Mr. Roosevelt was mistaken, misled, or carried beyond all bounds by disappointed ambition, or his friends and supporters on the national committee were, after 15 days of examination of contest cases, all misled or were wicked and disloyal to him.

Later, the cases still contested were presented and argued at great length before the committee on credentials of the convention, and a period equal to five eight-hour days was consumed in hearing and consideration of contests. No one was denied a hearing; ample time was allowed. By a majority of more than two-thirds, including, in most cases, the members from States whose delegates were not for either Mr. Taft or Mr. Roosevelt, the committee decided the cases as they had been decided by the national committee.

The fact is, that in cases of doubt, the doubt was generally resolved in favor of delegates pledged to Mr. Roosevelt. Much has been said of the two delegates from the fourth California district. The fact is that under terms of the call for the committee none of the Roosevelt district delegates from California were entitled to seats, and yet they were all seated, except in the district where the Taft delegates had a clear majority.

The Republican Party has always stood for the principle of local representation and can not agree to the doctrine that the people of a district shall be disfranchised in the election of their own representatives by the vote of people living outside the district. If the policy adopted in California should become general, New York City, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Chicago, and other large cities would elect and control all the delegates to national conventions from the States in which they were located. What a snap for bosses such a plan would be is proven by the fact that Boss Johnson absolutely controlled the California delegates.

CONTESTS HONESTLY DECIDED.

Not only were the delegates in the Republican convention at Chicago honestly seated, but the demand that no contested delegate should be allowed to vote on any question was most preposterous. No delegate was allowed to vote on his own case, but if the rule were adopted in conventions that no delegate placed on the temporary roll whose seat was contested was allowed to vote on any question, the flimsiest minority could absolutely control any convention by the simple process of disfranchising the majority by trumped-up eleventh-hour contests.

To fully realize how preposterous the proposition presented was, it should be remembered that it was not proposed to deny all of the 252 delegates whose seats had been contested the right to participate in the convention, or to deny that right to any of the Roosevelt delegates whose seats had been contested by Taft men. The demand was made as to a select list referred to as 92, but really only 72, of Taft delegates who, a self-appointed arbiter had taken it upon himself to judge, were not entitled to seats, though he had not heard a single contest presented or argued. This action reminds one of the case of the hotel keeper who, having presented an exorbitant bill to a departing guest, was interrogated by the guest as to just why he fixed his outrageous charge at the exact figure he did, to which the landlord grimly replied that he had been doing some figuring and had concluded that was exactly the sum he needed in his business.

Unfortunately, many good people have been misled by the cocksureness and vehemence of the charges made against the action at Chicago in the seating of delegates. Such people should recall that the leaders of a movement may originally be

misled by the statements of superserviceable and dishonest subordinates on whose suggestions contests have been brought. Once having made declaration, disappointment, the lack of courage to confess an error, or overweening personal ambition will sometimes lead men to almost any length or act or accusation.

Those Republicans who are inclined to follow the third-party movement should ponder long before doing so. While the leader of the movement did not secure delegates enough to place him in nomination, he could have brought about the nomination of any one of half a dozen candidates known as leaders in the so-called progressive movement long before he sought to appropriate to himself the strength of that movement; but he refused to do so or to allow his supporters to do so, insisting that if there was to be a compromise, "the compromise candidate will be me."

THE THIRD TERM.

I can not believe the people will support a third-term candidate. *The warning and example of Washington and all the great men of our history are against it. The present aspirant for the third term has, in the most solemn manner, declared against it.* Furthermore, I can not imagine how a movement can commend itself which is notoriously financed and fostered by the heads of great trusts which the Government is prosecuting. Self-seeking men will join a movement because of the fact that it has unlimited corporate capital backing it, as we are constantly assured by its friends that the third party has, but it certainly can not appeal on that ground to the ordinary citizen. Mr. Perkins and other great trust magnates are not likely to go into political movements requiring large outlay without expecting a return on their investment in the opportunities to plunder the people. A party long established, with complete organization, may carry on a campaign with a limited amount of contributions, but to build up an entirely new organization is a costly process. The plan of Government regulated and controlled monopolies advocated by Mr. Perkins and other leaders of high finance and approved by Mr. Roosevelt *only needs a complaisant administration to make easy the oppression and looting of the public to an extent beyond the dreams of avarice.*

Nor can the common people be expected to follow in the lead of rich dilettantes like the Pinchots and the McCormicks who, born to great wealth and the possessors of vast incomes which they find it hard to spend, with no practical knowledge of or real sympathy for the struggles, the trials, and the problems of the plain people, are eager for power that they may exploit their theories and gratify their ambitions at the expense of the public. *Add to these the Flinns and the Wards and all the other representatives of the worst types of bossism, masquerading under a false pretense and groping for issues which it is hoped will temporarily mislead the people, and the wonder is that they can secure any considerable following, particularly when to follow the third party only serves to aid the Democratic candidate.*

OPPORTUNITY FOR USEFUL SERVICE.

The Republican Party is to-day, as it has always been, big enough to afford an opportunity within its ranks for useful work and earnest and faithful endeavor for men of widely differing views as to the wisest course to pursue to secure the best results in the interests of all of the people in matters of detail of procedure, administration, and legislation. Its glorious history, its marvelous record of achievement, its long line of patriots and statesmen among the wisest, the bravest, and the best in American history, all of these are at one and the same time an inspiration to party loyalty and an assurance that if, forgetting minor differences, we stand shoulder to shoulder for our great principles we shall accomplish as much in the future for the cause of liberty and righteousness and good government as has been accomplished in the past.

The Republican Party is to-day as it always has been the *true party of progress.* It has, like all organizations composed of mortal men, made mistakes, but it never has as a party been guilty of a *fraud or dodged an issue.* There have been times in its history when it might have purchased temporary success at the price of abandonment of principle, but as it refused to excuse or temporize with slavery, as it declined to compromise the national credit in the day of greenbackism, as it stood as a wall of defense against the depreciation of the currency in 1896, as it has declined to abandon the doctrine of protection in the hours when it was temporarily unpopular, as it stood for the rights of the black man even at the cost of success in the South, so it stands to-day, determined in its adherence to the fundamental principles of our Government, steadfast for the protection of the rights of all classes of citizens, and firm in its faith and confidence in the wisdom of the ultimate judgment of the people.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE].

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this bill is the same as House bill 12812, introduced in the first session of the Sixty-second Congress.

That bill was agreed to in conference between the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and it was finally adopted by both branches and submitted to the President. He promptly vetoed it, and his veto was sustained.

At that time the report from the Tariff Board had not been received. The Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee prepared their former bill without holding any hearings for the purpose of obtaining any information from either the manufacturers of cotton goods or the operatives employed in this great industry.

This action was in conspicuous contrast with past actions by the Committees on Ways and Means of both the Republican and the Democratic Parties.

When the Wilson bill was prepared, the committee, a majority of whom were Democrats, listened patiently to the testimony of both manufacturers and operatives, who were sent from New England to Washington to give the information which was then eagerly sought for the purpose of submitting a bill which should foster and promote the cotton-manufacturing industry. The result was that a bill was adopted by the Congress which, in so far as it related to the cotton industry, was acceptable to both capital and labor.

Had the Ways and Means Committee of that Congress displayed as much wisdom and common sense in preparing the remaining schedules of the Wilson Tariff Act, and had they also not allowed themselves to become Bryanized, and rushed wildly after the financial heresies accompanying the "free-silver" crusade, the victory of the Republican Party in the campaign of 1896 might never have been written into history. But, true to its past history, the Democratic Party blundered in the preparation of the Wilson Tariff Act, and the result was that mills and all classes of manufactures were unfortunately and vitally affected. Men and women were thrown out of employment, with the usual result that when the wage earner is deprived of his wages his purchasing power is reduced. His inability to obtain the necessities of life immediately affected the farmer in the disposition of the products of his farm, and the result was there was general business depression and disaster.

This showed how interdependent we are. There can be no permanent prosperity where a definite attempt is made to attack any especial industry of such vital importance to both the North and the South as the cotton industry is by so reducing the duties upon manufactured products that, in addition to the competition between manufacturers in this country, these manufacturers and their employees shall be subject to the competition of foreign manufacturers and foreign labor. A careful investigation would have disclosed the fact that domestic competition so reduces the price of the manufacture of cotton goods that the profits, except in rare cases, are very limited.

The added competition of the foreign manufacturer which this bill will certainly produce would only result in a reduction of the price of the product below the necessary profit required to keep the cotton mills running, and if this foreign competition continued, as it certainly would, the inevitable result would be a reduction in the cost of production at home. If that reduction in cost of manufacture necessitates a reduction of wages and the stopping of mills, it would disastrously affect the wageworker and his family by depriving him of employment.

I fail to understand the wisdom or logic which takes possession of the Democratic majority and leads them to promote legislation of the character written into this bill when past experience has shown that it leads to disaster to business interests of great importance and, worse than all, the throwing out of employment thousands of men, women, and children who find work and wages, which means happiness in the home and greater opportunity for the education of the rising generation. I have heretofore referred to the wisdom displayed in the preparation of the cotton schedules of the Wilson Tariff Act in 1894. The Committee on Ways and Means gave patient attention to the testimony of both operatives and manufacturers, and they were induced by the prominent representatives of the Democratic Party in New England to so write the cotton schedule that the industry which was then of so great importance to that section of the United States that even the Democratic leaders then in Congress hesitated and gave such consideration to the facts that had been furnished them that they

proceeded to prepare a bill which dealt reasonably fair with both the operative and the manufacturer.

The cotton manufacturing industry in the South was developing largely then by the influx of capital and the furnishing of machinery by machinery builders from the Northern States, and there were no large southern investments in the industry there. Consequently the tariff was virtually prepared throughout through the assistance and advice of the northern operative and manufacturer in the cotton industry.

The election of 1896 restored the Republican Party to power and the Dingley Tariff Act was written into law. Hearings were held and all of the schedules were given careful consideration. Operatives and manufacturers in the cotton industry appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and expressed themselves satisfied with the cotton schedules, and the only changes made in the cotton tariff were a very few, made necessary by changes in the processes of manufacture, and the consequent need of guarding against the competition of the foreign manufacturer. In fact, the tariff, in so far as it related to the cotton industry, was practically unchanged. The general revival of business in every other line of manufacture gave a healthful impetus to the cotton industry.

Mr. Speaker, I have never known of such a scale of wages prevailing as marked the period from March 4, 1857, to March 4, 1861, or of such a long period of lack of employment as marked the history of that memorable Democratic administration.

For the first time since 1861 the cotton manufacturing industry has been singled out for attack by the Democratic majority in the Sixty-second Congress.

There is no other industry in the country which can show as small a margin of profit in a general sense as the cotton industry. That there have been phenomenal cases where conditions in the purchase of raw material, ability in management of the plant, and fortunate conditions have prevailed in disposing of the product at limited periods where the business has been profitable, but those conditions have been the exception and not the inflexible rule. Foreign competition will make the conditions in the United States disastrous to the ordinary manufacturer and injurious to the more successful and prosperous manufacturer.

It has frequently been the experience of the cotton operative that long-continued depression and disastrous conditions to the manufacturer result in a reduction in the wage scale, for that is an element of cost that is most easily attackable when competition becomes so keen that profits are eliminated.

The competition is, and has been, so keen for a long period in the cotton industry in our own country that prices of cloth and yarn, except in particular and especial lines, show but a small margin of profit.

The cotton-goods schedules prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means of this House in the Payne Tariff Act were practically unchanged when that bill was sent from this body to the north end of the Capitol.

In another body it was deemed wise to make many important changes in the bill to meet the changing conditions in the industry and to provide for checkmating and reducing the competition from the fine cotton-goods industry in foreign countries. I listened to the debates that took place at that time, and certainly, from samples of goods shown and facts given as to the construction of the law by appraisers and decisions of the courts, there appeared to me to be ample reason for a more specific and definite tariff to be determined in order that the fine-goods industry in this country might receive more ample and definite protection from the competition of the manufacturers from abroad.

Amendments were offered and were finally considered in a conference between the committees of the two Houses, and the Payne-Aldrich Act was enacted into law.

The principal objections to the cotton schedules of that measure came from the interests of the importers, wholesalers, and the large department stores of the country. The newspapers, on account of dissatisfaction arising from the wood-pulp and printer-paper schedules, very largely joined hands with the importing interests in attacks upon the bill. The importers are an important aggregation of business men in New York and other large business centers. They have no interest or sympathy with those who toil for their daily bread, nor are they engaged in promoting or encouraging the manufacturing industries of the United States, because they find their most profitable occupation to discredit the tariff laws of the United States and also to make it easier to bring into our seaports the products of other countries where the wages paid the employees are smaller and the cost of maintenance and fixed charges of the manu-

facturing plants are less than those of similar establishments in the United States.

These men are alert, sharp, and naturally they endeavor to provide for their own households, and they do not give consideration to American interest preferentially over the interests of the foreigner, and therefore they become powerful allies with the free traders, tariff reformers, and incidentally they naturally gravitate to the Democratic Party in its present efforts to destroy the tariff wall which has for so long a period defended the interests of American industries and American labor. I have read the earnest appeals of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, whose headquarters are at Charlotte, N. C., addressed to the chairman and members of the Committee on Ways and Means asking that they would give heed to their demand that the cotton schedule should not be subject to a radical revision without granting to these important factors in the development of the southern cotton industry an opportunity to appear before the committee and present facts for their consideration. If I am correctly informed this request was denied.

One of the most prominent and successful manufacturers in the district which I have the honor to represent is Mr. Walter H. Langshaw, president and agent of the Dartmouth & Bristol Mills, of New Bedford, Mass., who expressed some criticisms of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act, and it was quite natural that Chairman UNDERWOOD, of the Committee on Ways and Means, should look to him for aid and assistance in destroying the effectiveness of that act.

Mr. Langshaw wrote to Mr. UNDERWOOD during the special session of the Sixty-second Congress expressing his inability to aid in preparing the schedules of the pending bill, because of the complex nature of the work and lack of time to properly prepare for such an important undertaking. Mr. Langshaw further expresses his regret that men connected with the dry goods committee, comprised largely of importers, had been engaged for the purpose of assisting in making a new cotton schedule, and he informed Mr. UNDERWOOD that he would not wish to be identified with men whose interests lie so diametrically opposed to those of investors in this country, and whose statements are the best evidence of their ignorance on the subject. As for a revision by politicians, Mr. Langshaw states he has no patience with that. Mr. Langshaw also further added that he esteemed the time too limited at that session of Congress to do the work justice, and he further stated that he does not want, either directly or indirectly, to be identified with such bungling as has been done in the past or with any action for which political expediency is a dominating factor. This plain language from a successful manufacturer who is in no sense a "standpatter" ought to be carefully considered. Neither Mr. Langshaw nor anyone else was granted a hearing by the Committee on Ways and Means.

I also quote the following interview with Mr. John Hobin, secretary of the textile council of the city of New Bedford, Mass., as taken from the New Bedford Evening Standard of July 26, 1911:

OPERATIVES INTERESTED—FEAR RADICAL REDUCTION IN TARIFF ON COTTONS—NOT OPPOSED, HOWEVER, TO SLIGHT LOWERING OF RATES TO LEVEL OF THE DINGLEY BILL—INCREASES NOT ASKED FOR HAVE PROVED DETRIMENTAL TO THE MILL WORKERS.

That the textile operatives of this city and of other cotton-manufacturing centers strenuously object to the proposed radical reductions in the cotton schedule, although they insist that some reductions should be made, is the opinion of John Hobin, secretary of the textile council of this city. While cotton manufacturers, converters, finishers, importers, and politicians are quarreling over what should be done with the cotton schedule—which was presumably framed to protect the wage earner in American cotton mills—this expression of opinion from a prominent official of the labor men themselves ought to have interest.

"When the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was under discussion," Mr. Hobin said yesterday, "the textile unions joined with the manufacturers in a petition that the cotton schedules be retained at the existing level. That was all they wanted, and, through the delegation that the United Textile Workers sent down to Washington, all they asked. They certainly did not want the duties pushed up higher, as was done. So they are consistent when they ask that the cotton schedules be reduced."

"We feel that the raising of the duties is as injurious to the wage earner as would be a serious reduction in them. By the undue elevation of the duties, the converters and retailers have been permitted to charge prices for the cloth so high as to place them comparatively out of reach of a large part of the consumers. We believe that the retention of the present abnormally high duties can not fail to produce such high prices for cloth as to limit the market and force curtailment in the industry."

"But, on the other hand," Mr. Hobin continued, "we protest against the reduction of duties to the extent proposed by the Democrats. In saying this I am not raising a party issue nor talking from a political standpoint. I believe that the textile operatives as a whole feel the same way, irrespective of politics. We are very much afraid that the party in power at Washington is going to injure us as seriously by reductions in the tariff as the other party did by undue elevations of it."

"Personally, I favor very much President Taft's scheme of submitting this matter to a Tariff Commission. The cotton schedule ought to be capable of scientific adjustment, and in my opinion this is the best solution of the problem."

The pending bill proposes to benefit the consumer by creating greater competition for the American manufacturer by reducing the tariff on imports to such an extent that the American manufacturer will be compelled to lower his cost of production to enable him to meet this new element of competition, if this bill should be enacted into law. As previously stated, there were, in 1910, 1,713 cotton mills, all constructed at high cost of labor, material, and machinery; very much higher in cost than our foreign competitors are called upon to pay. These mills are too costly and are built of too heavy material to be removed from their present locations, even if more favorable locations could be obtained, and these facts ought to receive consideration when new elements of competition are to be suddenly forced upon the investor by the proposed radical reduction of the tariff.

The proposed revision of the tariff affects every one of the 1,713 cotton mills in the United States and every one of the vast number of operatives in the different mills in many States of the Union, but it more directly and unfavorably affects the finer grades of yarns and finer qualities of cotton cloth than any other product of the industry, for the importations have been in the past, and will continue to be in the future, on the finer qualities of production, and the amount of the importations will, in the judgment of every manufacturer and operative whose views I have seen quoted, exceed by manyfold the estimate quoted by the chairman of the committee in presenting the proposed bill.

New Bedford, Mass., is the center of the fine-yarn and fine-goods industry in the United States, and although Fall River, Mass., exceeds it in number of cotton spindles, it ranks second in the production of fine yarns and fine goods. These two great cotton centers will be called upon to bear the greater burden which the reduction of the tariff proposed in this bill will impose upon any community in the United States. I protest against this proposed iniquitous legislation in the name of and in behalf of every man, woman, and child in the district which I have the honor to represent on this floor.

Under the existing tariff act the cotton business has been fairly prosperous, and continuous employment has been the rule rather than the exception.

Wages have been increased and the hours of labor have been reduced in the cotton industry in the State which I represent, in part, on this floor. There is a strike in the city of New Bedford, in the district which I have the honor to represent, occasioned by a difference of opinion between the operative and the manufacturer on the question of fining the operatives for imperfect work in the weaving departments. While this difference of opinion on this question is very unfortunate, it is not in any way involved in the tariff problem.

In the first session of the Sixty-second Congress House bill 12812 was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and it was adopted and reported to the House of Representatives by the Democratic majority of said committee. For some reason best known to the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means they did not hold any public hearings on the bill. It was reported to the House and only a very limited time for debate was allowed. The bill was finally passed by the House. It went to the Senate and the bill was agreed to and it was presented to the President for approval or disapproval. It met with the disapproval of the President.

At that time there was no report from the Tariff Board, and the President showed the inconsistencies and fallacies of the bill, which he thought was prepared without due care and consideration and without having possession of facts necessary to the framing of a bill of such vital importance to the many thousands employed in this industry and to the large amount of capital invested in the industry.

After the bill had passed the House it had been sent to the Senate. Southern manufacturers sought there an opportunity to be heard regarding some phases of the industry which vitally affected them, but they were denied the privilege of presenting their views except in a limited manner.

It was not expected that any bill affecting the manufactures of cotton would be presented at this session of Congress. But as the other body began to actively consider other tariff schedules on the floor of the Senate, the Democratic majority of the Committee on Ways and Means determined to report another bill to the House. It was supposed, in view of the report of the Tariff Board, which they by their votes had helped to create in the Sixty-first Congress, and the objections made by the President in his veto of House bill 12812, that in the presenting of a new bill some features might be changed so that there might be some possibility of enacting into law a bill which should meet the approval of the President.

But with the same obstinacy that has characterized all attempts to prepare tariff bills, we find ourselves confronted with the same bill that had heretofore been debated and passed by both the House and Senate. Not an "i" dotted nor a "t" crossed, but a change in number only, being the result of many months' incubation.

That is certainly constructive statesmanship with a vengeance. It involves no labor to prepare such a bill, because with no hearings being held the only act necessary is to put a new number on the bill and report the same to the House. I think no one will be deceived by such unheard-of practices.

Clearly the bill was only introduced in order to demonstrate that the Congress was busy with tariff legislation, and therefore there was some excuse for the two bodies to remain on guard in Washington. The discourtesy shown to operatives and manufacturers by the abrupt refusal of the Committee on Ways and Means to grant any opportunity for the presentation of facts showing the bearing that the proposed changes in the cotton tariff would have on the wage earners as well as the manufacturers was in marked contrast to the course pursued in the preparation and consideration of the Wilson tariff, the Dingley tariff, or the Payne tariff acts and all former tariff bills heretofore enacted, all of which have vitally affected the grower of cotton or the operative or manufacturer.

The district which honors me with its confidence contains more than one-fourth of all the cotton spindles in the United States, and the city of Fall River, Mass., where I reside, has more than one-seventh of all the cotton spindles in the country.

Nearly 70,000 persons are directly employed in the cotton mills of the district. The question of their employment and wages is not only of importance to themselves and their families, but it affects the farmers of the surrounding country, who obtain their sustenance by selling the products of their labor.

When the former bill was considered in the House of Representatives many questions were propounded to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

These he answered in a flippant manner, which I am sure would not have been applauded by the operatives in the cotton mills, but which had the approval of his partisan colleagues.

Nearly every one of these operatives in the cotton mills of New England know what it costs to make a yard of cloth, and they are also familiar with the selling price of the product. If the Members of this honorable body had the same amount of information, they would be a little more careful than they now are about throwing open the American market to the competition of the lower priced labor and the less cost of production, because of the less amount of capital invested by the foreign manufacturer in the construction of a similar manufacturing plant, in many of the countries on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean or in the oriental countries across the Pacific Ocean.

Who is calling for the reduction of the tariff on cotton goods? I will answer, the free trader. His love of country is based upon the narrow idea of procuring whatever he needs for his comfort, luxury, or necessity in the cheapest market. He thinks not of employment for his fellow men. He can not see beyond himself. He is the best representative of sordid selfishness. The golden rule is not one of his cardinal precepts.

Does anyone in his right mind believe that a single person employed in a cotton manufacturing plant is complaining of the high price of the product of his labor? They realize that the market price of the product of their labor is but slightly above the cost of production. They know that if the theories of the Democratic Party are put into practice the result will be that goods will be manufactured abroad, and as a consequence they know that every yard of goods manufactured abroad will take the place of the products of American labor.

Neither the mill operative, the manufacturer, or the laborer is calling for a reduction of the tariff on cotton goods. Therefore we can conclude that the nonproducer is the element in society which is calling the loudest for a reduction of tariff duties on cotton goods.

The laboring and producing members of the body politic can not agree to a reduction of duties when they know that it would result in providing more employment for mill operatives in Great Britain, Continental Europe, India, Japan, or China, and no argument put forth by gentlemen on the other side of the aisle regarding the cheapness with which goods can be produced abroad and the advantage it would be to have the tariff reduced so that these productions of foreign capital and foreign labor can be more readily brought into competition with the capital and laborers employed in the cotton mills of this country will be accepted as logical.

Past experience has demonstrated every time this antiquated method of producing prosperity has been put in practice by the unwise legislation of the Democratic Party that it brings disaster and ruin to the cotton industry, and distress, lack of employment, and deprivation of the comforts of life to the mill operative and his family.

I am opposed to all such theories, as the Democratic Party by proposing such legislation endeavors to foist upon the people, because it can benefit no one; but on the other hand it means disaster to the capitalist and distress and ruin to the operative.

As it would take away the purchasing power of both of the parties I have alluded to, each of whom are dependent upon the prosperity of the other, it would have a far-reaching influence upon every other industry in the United States.

We have indications of great crops of every kind to be produced by the American farmer.

Every citizen of the United States is vitally interested in the production of the necessities of life. I would assume that no American with a spark of patriotism in his soul would desire that the producer of raw cotton should be compelled to sell the product of his investment and labor at a price below the cost of production.

In fact, I believe that it is a sound business proposition that labor and capital should find adequate compensation. Cotton is distinctively an American product, which is practically without competition from abroad. It has puzzled my brain to understand why the Democratic majority in this House, when to that cotton is added the cost of erecting a factory building and equipping the same with machinery, there should be a determined and insistent demand that the product of that added labor and capital should be subjected to competition from abroad.

This is an unexplainable mystery, which the American voter will be interested to have explained without equivocation in the coming national campaign by the Democratic orators at the same time that they are whining because President Taft vetoes their ill-considered and carelessly prepared legislation which they send to him not with the purpose of having the same enacted into law, but with the intention of putting the President "into a hole."

My colleague from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], a single member of the Republican minority of the Ways and Means Committee, presented a bill which was supported by nearly all of the minority Members present in the House.

The gentleman from Connecticut is able and distinguished. He was for many years a successful woolen manufacturer.

There is a vast difference between the manufactures of cotton and that of wool. I would coincide quite fully with his views on the wool industry, but I could not coincide with his conclusions on the cotton industry. Therefore I voted against the bill presented by Mr. HILL, as I did against the bill reported by Mr. UNDERWOOD, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Neither of them, in my judgment, were accorded sufficient consideration or hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means—the most important committee of the House of Representatives.

The Democratic Party were in full control of the Government from March 4, 1853, to March 4, 1861.

After that period they were sometimes in control of the House and sometimes in the control of the Senate. They have been twice intrusted with the office of President, and during the sessions of the Fifty-fourth Congress they controlled the Senate and House in addition to the Presidency.

Their record of constructive legislation is practically unknown to the present generation.

During the year 1909 more than \$10,000,000 additional capital was invested in the fine yarn and fine goods industry in the city of New Bedford, and more than \$6,000,000 was invested in that city during the year 1910. Sixteen mills in number were added to the number that the city formerly contained. They use the finer grades of sea-island and Egyptian cotton and the better grades of American cotton, and their product is very largely of the quality heretofore imported. The reduction of the tariff proposed in this bill will cause a much greater quantity of similar products to pass the customhouses and enter into active and severe competition with the individuals who have massed their contributions in taking stock in the various corporations which have been organized to promote and extend this important industry.

During the past 10 years the city of New Bedford increased in population 54.6 per cent and now contains more than 100,000 people.

No adequate reason for the vicious attack made upon the principal industry of this thriving community by the proposed

bill has been advanced, nor is there any valid reason why the special industry located in the district which I have the honor to represent should be called upon to meet the great burden proposed to be inflicted upon it by the radical conditions contained in the bill presented in this House, and which it is proposed to enact into law as far as this House can, by a decree of the caucus of the Democratic Party, without granting a hearing to either the owners of the mills or the operatives who earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brows.

Before the special session of the Congress had been called after the adjournment of the last session of the Sixty-first Congress, during conversation which took place between myself and a leading cotton manufacturer of fine goods of my own city, he related to me an interesting fact, which I desire to bring to the attention of the Members of the House.

He stated a short time previously he had made up a grade of goods that he thought he could find a ready market for at the price of 8½ cents per yard. He placed the samples in the hands of his New York brokers, but owing to the depressed condition of the cotton industry no buyer could be found. He therefore placed the samples with a Boston broker, who received an offer of 8½ cents per yard. This offer was finally accepted.

After filling the first order and the same being duplicated and further demand seeming in prospect, the manufacturer stated that he journeyed to Boston and visited the large department store which had purchased the goods and sauntered around the great establishment until he arrived in that portion of the store where the goods were being sold to the consumer, and he found that the customers were buying these goods which he had sold at 8½ cents at 25 cents per yard.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle desire to benefit the consumer by the legislation which they enact, it is very clear to my mind, as I doubt not it is to yours and to the minds of those who listen to me to-day, that the point of attack should not be at the customhouse, but at some point to be determined by careful study and deliberation of the conditions which prevail between the manufacturer and the ultimate consumer.

The great advance and growth of the cotton-manufacturing industry in the Southern States is but a natural and welcome feature of the prosperity of the Nation itself. The northern manufacturer welcomes this new factor in the Nation's life. They recognize that the more modern factories and the former abundance of native help were advantages which, added to the close proximity to the raw material, were important factors in the competitive line of production to which they were compelled to adapt themselves.

The South has produced very largely the coarser grades of yarn and cloth. With the lapse of time and the benefit of experience and improvements in methods and machinery, the southern manufacturer at this time is seeking to produce the finer grades of yarn and cloth; but this condition arouses no feeling of indignation or dissatisfaction with their northern competitors.

The competition of the foreign manufacturer, who is not bound by American regulations, American standards of living, American wages, nor hampered by the larger capital required to construct and maintain his plant, is the competition to which neither the northern nor southern manufacturer have heretofore been subjected; and by the granting of reductions at the customhouse to the foreign manufacturers, who have long sought the American market—the best market in the world—the provisions of the pending bill will make it a great deal easier for them to flood the American market with the products of their capital and labor to the detriment of American industries and American labor.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, realizing that education has been one of the greatest factors in its advancement to the higher standards of excellence since the Pilgrim Fathers nearly 300 years ago landed on Plymouth Rock, several years ago entered upon the policy of establishing textile schools, in order that the rising generation might be the better equipped with the requisite knowledge in the production of higher grades of textile manufacturing. Builders of modern, improved machinery contributed liberally to each of three textile schools established in that Commonwealth. The State appropriated the money necessary for their construction, and the city of Lowell, where my colleague, Representative BUTLER AMES, resides, and the cities of Fall River and New Bedford, in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, cooperated with the State in providing money for their maintenance in order to provide for the free education of its people.

The purpose of this higher education was to equip with experimental knowledge the rising generations, in order that they might produce the higher grades of textile manufacture in America, instead of buying the same abroad. No foreign manu-

facturer contributes to this enterprise, but by the provisions of the pending bill the foreign manufacturer finds encouragement at American customhouses to neutralize the efforts of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to improve its methods of textile manufactures and advance the interests of its citizens. I am one of the trustees of the textile school in Fall River and was the first signer of the petition for its establishment.

In the matter of hours of labor in the cotton manufacturing establishments Massachusetts takes the foremost rank. They were the first to enact the 10-hour law. By acts of legislation since that time they have reduced the hours of labor to 58 hours and to 56 hours, and the Legislature of Massachusetts, at its session for 1911, enacted the 54-hour law for cotton operatives, and it went into effect January 1, 1912.

Massachusetts has now a Democratic governor, but the Republican Party has always had a majority in its legislature since the party was formed in 1854, a period of 58 years.

Massachusetts is a manufacturing State. She produces none of the raw materials which her artisans, mechanics, and operatives by their labor, skill, and intelligence prepare for the use of the American people. She does not want the pending bill enacted into law.

If I were to be governed wholly by political considerations, I would gladly welcome the passage of the pending bill. But, Mr. Speaker, viewing the proposition upon the broader lines which should govern a subject of such great importance, I sincerely hope the bill may not be enacted into law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY].

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Dingley law as passed by the Republican Party in 1897 remained in force for 12 years, which was a longer existence than had been accorded to any other tariff act in the history of this country. For 10 years after the passage of this law the Republican Party confidently claimed that the country was prosperous as the result of this act. Yet a short study of the facts will show that prosperity resulted in spite of the Dingley Act, and not because of it. An exactly similar wave of prosperity followed the tariff act of 1846, which was passed by the Democrats and continued in force for 11 years, making it second to the Dingley Act in point of duration. This period is commonly spoken of as the free-trade era, though this act did no more than apply the principle of tariff for revenue on an ad valorem basis. During this period the country enjoyed a long era of prosperity, and this being the case, the tariff remained untouched, for the country was involved in a discussion of slavery and weightier questions were at issue. An exactly similar state of affairs explains the long continuance of the Dingley Act. The country, owing to internal conditions, prospered in spite of this law, and centered its attention upon the problem of dealing with great trust combinations, destined to be the great question of the twentieth century. These trusts owed their existence in a large measure to the high-protective tariff, hence after 10 years, prompted by the business complications resulting in the panic of 1907, the tariff came in for its share of attention and its revision was demanded by the American people as a step in the curbing of the trusts.

The Republican Party, having become conscious of the trend of public opinion, and of the general demand throughout the country for a reduction in tariff duties, went before the people in the campaign of 1908 with a promise of downward revision. They made the campaign solely on this issue, and the people of this country, relying on their promise of downward revision, returned the Republican Party to power.

On March 15, 1909, President Taft called an extraordinary session of Congress for the purpose of revising the tariff. The tariff was revised, but the Republican Party, unable to break away from the habits of a lifetime, again revised the tariff, not in the interests of the people whom they had been placed in power to serve, but in the interests of the great trusts of this country, to whom their first allegiance has always been given. As a result, the average ad valorem rate of duty on dutiable imports amounted in 1911 under the Payne-Aldrich Act to 41.22 per cent as compared with 44.16 per cent in 1905 under the Dingley Act. Because of the prohibitive rates of duty which exist on many articles in the present tariff act making it impossible for imports to come in, the average of 41.22 per cent in 1911 is below the average rate of duty assessed in the act. In the campaign of 1910 the Republican Party went before the people with this tariff as the fulfillment of its pledges to revise downward, and the results of that election show the appreciation felt by the people of this country for the way in which the Republican Party had broken faith with them. A Republican majority of 45 in the House of Representatives in

the Sixty-first Congress was changed to a Democratic majority of 68 in the Sixty-second Congress. The voice of the people had spoken, and in unmistakable terms it demanded lower tariff duties levied in the interests of the people of this country and not in the interests of predatory wealth.

Government is and has always been merely the organized form of the state through which the general will is expressed. The state, by which is meant the people of the entire country, and which is only another expression for the national consciousness, subject always to the limitations of the Constitution, is the supreme power, and when its will is clearly indicated it must be carried out. Government is only the mechanism for executing the will of the people, and that government best performs its functions which most nearly expresses the General Will, clearly and intelligently indicated. Of all the governments which have been evolved in the history of the world the American Government most nearly reaches perfection in this respect. It most nearly approaches man's ideal of a true democracy, and over the earlier democracies of the world it possesses the added advantage of certain checks, of which the chief bulwark is the Constitution, insuring stability to this Government and protecting the people from hasty and ill-advised changes in the fundamental principles of the Government. Once in two years the people of this country are given the opportunity of saying whether their will is being expressed by the manner in which the party in power is conducting the Government. Two years ago they showed in unmistakable terms their disapproval of the work of the Republican Party and of its policy, which has always been to levy tariff duties, not primarily for the support of this Government, but for the protection of the great corporations, with revenue for the Government as only an incidental factor.

The Democratic Party was restored to power in the House of Representatives on the promise that gradual reductions should be made and the tariff restored again to a basis of revenue. In compliance with these promises that party has proceeded to make a reduction in the schedules of the tariff to a point where they will give no unnecessary taxation while still yielding an income adequate for the support of the Government. The Democratic Party has never stood for free trade; it has always maintained that tariff duties for revenue should be imposed, and incidentally, of course, some protection will always follow. It has not held, however, as has the Republican Party, that protection should be the essential feature with revenue for the Government as only an incidental factor. It was Francis Lieber, one of the greatest political economists this country has ever seen, who, in speaking of duty in its higher sense, enunciated this maxim, "No right without its duty, no duty without its right." The latter part of this maxim, if we may be allowed to take duty in its tariff sense, may be said to well express the attitude of the Democratic Party toward the levying of tariff duties. No duty should be levied unless Congress has an absolute right to impose it, and the only right given Congress for levying any tariff duty is to provide sufficient revenue for the support of the Government. This principle is enunciated in the words of that great Democrat, Andrew Jackson, whom I quote with especial pride because he was born in the district which I have the honor of representing in this House. In his farewell message he said:

There is perhaps no one of the powers conferred on the Federal Government so liable to abuse as the taxing power. The most productive and convenient sources of revenue were necessarily given to it, that it might be able to perform the most important duties imposed upon it; and the taxes which it lays upon commerce being concealed from the real payer in the price of the article do not so readily attract the attention of the people as smaller sums demanded from them directly by the tax gatherer. But the taxes imposed on goods enhance by so much the price of the commodity to the consumer, and as many of these duties are imposed on articles of necessity which are daily used by the great body of the people, the money raised by these imposts is drawn from their pockets. Congress has no right under the Constitution to take money from the people unless it is required to execute some one of the specific powers intrusted to the Government; and if they raise more than is necessary for such purposes it is an abuse of the power of taxation, both unjust and oppressive. It may, indeed, happen that the revenue will sometimes exceed the amount anticipated when the taxes were laid. When, however, this is ascertained it is easy to reduce them; and in such case it is unquestionably the duty of the Government to reduce them, for no circumstance can justify it in assuming a power not given to it by the Constitution, nor in taking away the money of the people when it is not needed for the legitimate wants of the Government.

In these words are found a true statement of Democratic principles. The Democratic Party has remained true to its standards, and to-day stands as the champion of the great mass of the citizens of this Republic, advocating, as regards both the humblest citizen and the greatest corporation, equal rights and equal privileges. The words of Jackson are reechoed in the latest platform of the Democratic Party, as well as the platform of 1908, upon which that party was restored to power in

the House of Representatives, and from which I quote the following plank:

We favor immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list, and material reductions should be made in the tariff upon the necessities of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home, and gradual reductions should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis.

Immediately upon the convening of Congress in April, 1911, the Democrats of the House of Representatives proceeded to a fulfillment of these pledges. Tariff bills were passed by the House so just and beneficial in their provisions that not even a Republican Senate dared to stop their passage, and but for the hasty vetoes of a Republican President would have resulted in laws of untold benefit to this country.

The first bill passed by the Sixty-second Congress was the farmers' free list, which removed all tariff duties from agricultural implements, leather, boots and shoes, cotton ties, cotton bagging, lumber, meat, flour, food preparations, saddles and harness, salt, fence wire, and sewing machines. The estimated total value of these articles consumed in this country per annum is \$2,760,000,000. The tariff rate on them ranged under the Payne-Aldrich law from 7 per cent to 51 per cent, or an average of about 18.75 per cent on the entire group. Now, assuming that the rate of tariff duty is 50 per cent effective in increasing prices to the consumer, the estimated saving to the consumers of this country from putting these articles on the free list would have amounted to \$390,000,000 in a 12-months' period. This saving would have been directly felt, especially by the poorer people of the country, for the articles from which it was proposed to remove tariff duties are all among the first necessities of life. The President, although elected upon a platform promising reduction in tariff duties and of the cost of living, at once vetoed the Underwood bill, giving as a pretext that he had not yet heard from his so-called Tariff Board, and therefore any tariff revision made by the Democrats was unreliable.

No Tariff Board report or the report of any other board is necessary to show that tariff duties should be removed from the articles included in this bill. Agricultural implements, so necessary to the great farming class, which is the backbone and future hope of this country, are taxed so heavily that a complete monopoly is given to the Harvester Trust, and the farmer is forced to pay whatever price that trust demands. In fact, the protection given this trust is so high that the cost of transportation can be paid on American-made machines and they may still be sold abroad, with profit, at a lower price than they are sold at home. The same thing is true of sewing machines, which are as much a necessity to the American household as are agricultural implements to the farmer. When the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was before Congress manufacturers of boots and shoes declared that if hides were put upon the free list they could manufacture boots and shoes in competition with the world. In the Underwood bill hides have been put upon the free list, and there is therefore no reason why protection should be granted to manufacturers of boots and shoes. Meats, flour, timber, salt, cement, and lime are among the first necessities of life to all the 92,000,000 people of this country, and any protective duty placed upon them only raises the cost of living for those who can least afford to pay it.

This country has become an exporting rather than an importing country as regards these articles, and there can be no excuse, therefore, even from a protective standpoint, for keeping them on the tax list. To illustrate, our production of agricultural implements amounts to almost \$111,000,000 per annum, our exports of them to over \$25,000,000, and our imports to less than \$170,000. Again, in the case of fresh and preserved meats our production is valued at approximately \$800,000,000, of which we export about \$150,000,000 and import about \$500,000.

In view of facts such as these it is evident that tariff duties on the above-named articles bring to the Government a minimum amount of revenue. Yet the policy of the Republican Party is to maintain a high duty on these articles, although it results in little benefit to the Government and in great hardship to the consumers. The Democratic platform, on the other hand, declares specifically that it favors the placing upon the free list of trust-controlled products and material reductions in the tariff duties upon the necessities of life. The free-list bill as passed by the Democrats of this House and by the Senate was in full compliance with this declaration, and, as was said above, had it become law it is estimated that the saving to the American consumer would have been over \$390,000,000 per annum.

The next bill passed by the Democrats of the House was one reducing the duties on wool. The tariff duties on wool as contained in Schedule K of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill were de-

clared by President Taft himself in his Winona speech in 1910 as being "indefensible."

In this schedule as now constituted under the Payne bill the Republican principle of protection finds a more complete expression than in any other schedule of the tariff. On woolen goods, which after food are among the first necessities of life for all the people of this country, a tax was placed by the Republican Party which was almost prohibitive. The ad valorem tariff rate on imported woolen manufactures for 1910 was 90.10 per cent, being the highest rate imposed by the Payne-Aldrich law. Such a rate is not designed to obtain revenue for the Government, for by its very nature it is so prohibitive as to yield very little revenue. It is levied in the interest of the woolen manufacturers, and in effect gives them complete control over the woolen trade in America.

In 1909 we imported \$18,102,416 of woolen manufactures, as against a production at home of \$514,732,000. At the same time the woolen manufactures which we exported amounted to only the nominal sum of \$1,971,739, thus showing what a complete control of the American woolen market has been given to the American woolen manufacturers. Yet such a state of affairs is in accordance with the avowed Republican principle of protection, which holds, as announced in its 1908 platform—

that the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

In accordance also with the Republican idea to insure protection to the American manufacturers, the manufacturer himself was allowed to state to the Ways and Means Committee what was the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, and his statements were blindly followed by the Republicans and the rates fixed in accordance with them. That persons so vitally interested in the result should have been allowed to testify at all seems surprising, and the inaccuracy of their statements, upon which the schedule was based, can not be a matter of wonder. These manufacturers declared with much insistence that to maintain "the true principle" of protection the duties must be kept very high, if not higher than they were before. As a further proof that the prosperity of the country depended upon the maintenance of such high duties, they declared that otherwise they could not afford to pay such high wages as at present, and the workman would suffer. It was the old cry which has been raised so often, that to compete with cheap foreign labor the manufacturer must have protection if he is to pay the present high wages. Prof. Taussig exposes this fallacy in his *Tariff History of the United States*, page 365, from which is quoted the following extract:

One of the most familiar facts of industry, though one most commonly forgotten in the protective controversy, is that high wages do not necessarily mean high prices of things produced. When labor is effective high wages and low prices go together. The truth is that high general level of real wages is the outcome of high general efficiency of labor. Given such efficiency it would continue, tariff or no tariff.

In his speech of June 17, 1911, in this House, Mr. REDFIELD gives facts which clearly bear out these observations of Prof. Taussig and prove that because of the efficiency of the American workman high wages will continue to be paid and can afford to be, nor will high prices necessarily follow. Indeed, low prices result or else our American manufacturers could not afford to pay the high wages demanded by American laborers at home and yet sell goods in foreign countries, in competition with foreign labor, as many American concerns certainly do. All this goes to prove the inaccuracy of the statements made by manufacturers upon which the woolen schedule rates were based.

The Underwood bill, as passed by the Democrats, reduced the duty on raw wool from an equivalent ad valorem duty of 42.20 per cent in 1911 to an ad valorem rate of 20 per cent, and on manufactures of wool from an equivalent ad valorem rate of 87.65 per cent in 1911 to 42.55 per cent. Another change provided by the bill was the substitution of ad valorem duties for the combination of specific and ad valorem duties, which make the interpretation of the Payne-Aldrich bill impossible by any except a Government expert. The President, however, chose to veto this bill also, and the woolen trusts were allowed to further enrich themselves at the expense of the consumers in this country.

At the present session of Congress the report of the President's Tariff Board, on which he placed so much reliance, was submitted to the House of Representatives.

It was carefully analyzed by the Democrats, but was found to contain no information which justified the Democrats in changing the woolen bill as passed at the last session. Not even the Republicans can agree on what the report of the Tariff Board means, or what would be a fair rate, in accordance with the so-called scientific information. This grows out of the impracticability of the theory of the President and his party of at-

tempting to ascertain the difference in cost of production here and abroad. Had the President chosen to aid the Democrats in their efforts to serve the country by passing the woolen bill of last session over \$50,000,000 in the past 12 months would have been left in the hands of the American people. Such, however, would not be in accordance with the avowed Republican program of protection for the trusts.

The next schedule which the Democrats undertook to revise at the last session of Congress was the cotton schedule. Under the Payne-Aldrich law an equivalent ad valorem duty of 47.05 per cent during 1911 was imposed on all cotton manufactures. The Democrats passed a bill through the House reducing the duties to an average of 27.06 per cent, but the presidential veto was again evoked to prevent the enactment of this measure into law. On March 26, 1912, the President sent a message to Congress with which he submitted a report of the Tariff Board on the cotton schedule. As with the wool report of the Tariff Board, the Democrats very carefully analyzed the cotton data thus submitted with a view to checking up the results of their work of last summer on the cotton schedule. No reason was found for changing the rates of duty already fixed by the Democrats, and the cotton bill of last session was again introduced during the present session of Congress. As a matter of experiment, a Republican Member, under the guidance of the light shed by the Tariff Board's report, worked out a revision of the cotton schedule in accordance with the facts given in this report. As a result, the bill evolved by him is made to impose a duty within 2 per cent of the duty imposed under the Democratic bill of last session. It is certainly worthy of note that the Democrats, having access to the same information as had the Republicans in 1909, produced a bill levying a duty within 2 per cent of the rate recommended by the Tariff Board's report, while the Republicans, in 1909, evolved a bill levying a duty so far in excess of a justifiable rate.

At the present session of Congress the Democrats passed a bill reducing the duty on metals and the manufactures of metals from an average ad valorem rate in 1911 of 32.03 per cent under the Payne-Aldrich law to 22.42 per cent. The United States Steel Corporation, with its net earnings of a billion dollars in 10 years, is one of the most appalling examples of the giant growths that have sprung up under the Republican policy of high protection. No one is more interested in the prosperity of this country or in the growth of its commercial and manufacturing interests than is the Democratic Party, for in this age a country's greatness is, to a large extent, measured by its commercial supremacy. When, however, the growth of the corporate interests of a country is at the expense of the great mass of its citizens and works for the benefit, not of the people of the country, but of a small body of capitalists, then the further growth of such a corporation should not be aided by undue advantage given it by the Government under the guise of tariff laws. The United States Steel Corporation at the present time is in active competition with all the world in the manufactures of metals, and by such great steel manufacturers as Carnegie, Schwab, and Gary, it has been admitted that iron and steel products may be manufactured in this country as cheaply as anywhere in the world. The surplus products of the United States Steel Corporation are sold abroad in active competition with the markets of the world, and I contend that it is the duty of this Government not to promote a state of affairs where the foreigner and not the American citizen enjoys the advantages accruing from the marketing of this surplus production.

In the chemical schedule the Democrats reduced the duties from an average ad valorem rate in 1911 of 25.72 per cent, under the Payne-Aldrich law, to 16.66 per cent. This schedule was revised on a strictly revenue basis, reducing the duties on articles of general use, as medicine, chemicals, and dyestuff used in the wool, cotton, and paper industries, and placing the burden of raising the revenue on those industries most capable of supporting it.

Sugar has been placed by the Democrats on the free list. This bill will directly affect every household in this country by removing the heavy tax on an article of absolute necessity. Should the free-sugar bill proposed by the Democrats become law, fully \$115,000,000 annually, which the people of this country now pay to the Sugar Trust, will be saved. To make good the loss of \$53,000,000 in revenue from placing sugar on the free list the Democrats propose to raise sufficient revenue by an excise tax, which will extend the corporation tax so as to bring under it individuals, firms, and copartnerships, and will place the burden of taxation on those most able to bear it.

Such has been the constructive tariff legislation which the Democratic Party has tried to enact into law in accordance with the promise whereby it was restored to power in this House.

The tariff revision that has been proposed has been honest and made in the full conviction that it will result in benefit to the great mass of citizens of this Republic. The issue between the Democratic and the Republican Parties is clear. The policy of the Republican Party is to place on all articles manufactured in this country a tariff so high that the manufacturer will be protected from all outside competition. As a result a majority of the necessities of life (such as clothing, sugar, farming implements, sewing machines, and many other articles too numerous to mention) can be purchased in foreign countries at from 25 per cent to 100 per cent cheaper than they can be bought in the United States. From a tax on such goods the Government derives very little revenue, for the manufacture of practically all such articles is controlled by the trusts and the high protective tariff gives them a complete monopoly of the American market.

To illustrate, take the Steel Trust, the Harvester Trust, and the Meat Trust, to whom such protection is given by the law that they are enabled to charge the American consumer exorbitant and unreasonable prices for their products. From this high-protective tax maintained on their products practically no revenue goes in the Treasury of the United States, but a great deal of revenue does go into the pockets of these trusts. The revenue raised by tariff taxes annually amounts to a little more than \$330,000,000. For the money that is raised in this way for the support of the Government it is estimated that under the Republican tariff laws there is taken out of the pockets of the American consumer and given to the trusts more than two thousand million dollars, not one cent of which goes into the National Treasury.

Will the American people longer consent to be robbed in this way by Republican tariff laws, framed for the protection of the trusts of this country? The fight is on now, and I believe that in November the people of this country will assert their right to have the laws administered for their benefit, and will place the Democratic Party in full control of this Government. Since the Democrats came into power in the House of Representatives on the 4th of March, 1911, a Republican President and a Republican Senate have blocked the efforts of the Democrats to give relief to the people, but the time is near at hand when these obstacles will be removed.

In its convention at Baltimore the Democratic Party adopted a sane and truly progressive platform, and in it the wishes of the people of this country find complete expression. As candidates for President and Vice President, Democracy has nominated men whose splendid character, brilliant attainments, high order of statesmanship, and exalted patriotism are exemplified in both their public and private lives. Next November, by larger majorities than any Democratic nominees have received in the last 90 years, the people of this country will elect to the presidency, Woodrow Wilson, scholar, patriot, and statesman, and will place in the vice presidential chair that splendid type of American manhood, Indiana's favorite son, Thomas R. Marshall. These men on whom Democracy's choice has fallen, have made good abundantly in the offices they now hold as governor of their respective States. The American people in November will call them to higher stations and wider fields, confident that in the offices of President and Vice President the welfare of all the people, the prosperity of the whole country, and the perpetuity of its institutions will be safe in their hands. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] use the balance of his time?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has 20 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Alabama has 1 hour and 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to say anything on this subject this afternoon, inasmuch as I have talked so much about cotton, but still there are a few matters to which I wish to allude. The Tariff Board did not have time to send experts abroad to get the cost there in the thorough manner which they did upon the wool schedule, and hence the cost abroad does not appear in the board's report. They have, however, an exhaustive statement as to the prices abroad and the prices here, and an exhaustive and conclusive statement as to the cost in the factories in the United States. These are the facts upon which a bill must be based in the present tariff report.

I am not able to agree entirely with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] as to his conclusions concerning the bill which he introduces here. It is a much better bill than the bill presented by the majority of the committee, and for that reason I shall yield to the gentleman to make such motion as he desires in connection with it, and shall also vote to sub-

stitute it for the Underwood bill, reserving, however, to myself the privilege, if that report is ever completed by an investigation abroad, to act in accordance with the facts that then shall appear in the Tariff Board report.

The gentleman speaks of the duty placed upon mercerized goods under the present law; as he said upon mercerized manufactured goods we arrived at the duty from the statement of an old Member of the House, who had been for many years engaged in the cotton-goods industry, but who had been out of the business for several years at the time he made his statement. Later, when the matter came up before the conference committee, I found out to my satisfaction that we were misled about the difference in cost. The process of mercerization costs no more here than it does abroad. There is, however, some shrinkage in the weight and also in the measurement of the goods in going through the process of mercerization, and some duty was necessary in order to make up for the difference in the specific duties on those goods where they were based either upon the yard measure or upon the weight of the goods. But that was a small duty, and if there had been any amendment pending I should have exerted myself to have eliminated the duty on mercerized goods in the yard.

The mercerized process in yarn also costs no more here than abroad. It costs exactly the same, according to information I then obtained, and which is confirmed by the information obtained by the Tariff Board. But the duty on yarn in that bill was based on the 100-yard measurement, and I found in the process of mercerization that the length and weight of the yarn, the weight particularly, shrank 4 or 5 per cent. The Senate had put on a greater duty than that through misinformation, and I succeeded in putting it down to the exact difference according to the weight of the yarn, and I have no apology for the duty on the mercerization of yarn.

In the bill offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] and in the bill offered by the committee there is some discrimination in favor of mercerization, perhaps not to so great an extent, because the duty is the same per cent ad valorem on cloths in the gray and the mercerized cloth, and the difference in the value makes up the difference in the duty, which is equal to the shrinkage in the cloth. There is no advantage in either of these bills over the present law on that question.

An interesting subject for investigation at the time we made the present tariff law was the question of children's and women's hosiery, which got to be a national question, starting out of the countingroom of a department store in the city of Chicago, and advertised in the editorials of the Chicago papers, and it seemed as if the independence and hosiery, especially of the female sex were all bound up with what we proposed to do with children's and women's hose of a certain class.

We have accurate information, Mr. Speaker, as to the cost here and the cost abroad. We acted upon exact information, and we placed the additional duty on children's and women's stocking hose, and the women and children are all wearing hose to-day at the same retail price per pair, or per dozen pairs, under the schedule where we placed them in the present law, and they are happy. And there are thousands of young women, some of whom came here—young ladies who would grace any parlor in the land—to ask us to put on a little duty and start up the stocking mills. We did this, and we started the mills, and the girls are happy. And the women who came down here representing the department stores of Chicago are happy. And there is no one who feels any the worse for it except merchants in Chicago who are manufacturing stockings abroad and have to pay a little more duty to get them in here than they did before.

Now, what I object to in Mr. HILL's bill is that he did not preserve that duty according to the present law and not go into any ad valorem duty, however high it may be, and subject those mills to the tender mercies of the guilty consciences of those importers of stockings in this country who run the department stores and are not satisfied with getting retail and wholesale profits, but demand also the profits on undervaluations in getting those goods over here. He made a mistake in it; but his bill is better in that respect than the Underwood bill, because the duty upon these goods is higher.

Mr. Speaker, the Tariff Board's report shows that the cheaper grades of cotton cloths, such as they make in Alabama and the surrounding Southern States, and some of which business is left in some of the Northern States, are sold actually cheaper from the mills in the United States than abroad in competition with the mills we meet in mutual markets abroad; and, as the gentleman from Connecticut says, some of them have been sold in the Lancashire district in Great Britain, showing, or tending to show, at least, that they can be produced as cheaply or more cheaply here. And the Tariff Board supplied the reason for it in their report. We have been improving in cotton machinery,

and have got to that point where an American mechanic can run from 20 up to 28 looms at once, because of the automatic machinery which changes the bobbin from an empty bobbin to a full bobbin without stopping the operation of the machine or calling the attention of the operator of the machine.

Our people have introduced those looms almost exclusively in the United States in some makes of cotton goods. The same looms are open to our English competitors. They can buy them over there and make them there. They are allowed under the patents the same privileges of these machines that we have here. But they have not seen fit to adopt them.

Why? Because the rules of the labor unions in Great Britain prevent generally their using more than 4 looms per operative, instead of from 20 to 28 as here, and in consequence only 4 looms can be used there, while the manufactory is under the control of the labor unions over there.

That is the reason why we make these goods cheaper. We pay higher wages, and if they could run the 28 looms that we do they could make the goods more cheaply, and the difference would have to be met by a duty.

Now, that is a pretty uncertain foundation on which to base a tariff bill and an uncertain reason for taking off the duty, because now the labor unions seem to be controlling this thing. How long will it be before their grip will be removed? Why, it will be just when Great Britain loses her cotton trade, as she is now losing it, under these conditions that are imposed, to such an extent that the workman can not get even four looms to run, or any looms to run; and then labor will wake up and they will put in those men who are more efficient, even if they are as efficient as those who run the woolen looms, where labor produces more in England than it does in the United States.

When they do that we shall need the protective duty. It will take a little time to change that condition, but it is not safe to take off all the duty, and I believe that the duties provided for in the Hill bill ought at least to be kept on these goods. The author of the Hill bill has reduced the duties below those of the Underwood bill; he has cut them in two. On those goods the Hill bill has a protection, and the Underwood bill has protection twice over.

It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that there ought not to be any sectionalism in this bill. I do not like to charge that there is anything of the kind. It only "happens" so that these duties are so outrageously high on these goods that are made down there, and it "happened" when these gentlemen brought in a fake farmer's free-list bill that they put everything known to science in the farming industry and everything produced on farms in the Northern States on the free list, but rice was left off.

Rice remains where it is under the present law, with a protective duty upon it. Of course there was no design in that. That was thoroughly an accident. And accidents, like lightning, sometimes strike more than once in the same place. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Underwood bill is an unbalanced bill. It is prohibitive in some of its duties, and yet they call it a revenue-only measure. For heaven's sake, what do you gentlemen mean? Prohibitive revenues for revenue only! Yet you have them there.

Then when you come to knit goods, your bill does not measure up to protection, and you do not measure up to full revenue in your duty. So you go on a hop, skip, and jump all through the bill. Why did you not go over it again? Why did you not profit by what you have learned in the last year, even if you had to turn your backs on the Tariff Board report and maintain your insane opposition to what the people of this country want, namely, a board of experts to examine into all these subjects and report, in order that we may have a more intelligent tariff revision?

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I shall vote for the Hill substitute as a good deal better than the Underwood bill.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] will say I am looking at it from a different standpoint, that I am looking at it from a protectionist point of view. Well, I am looking at it from a point that will adjust the duties to the difference in cost here and abroad on these important articles. I stand for that, as I have always stood for it. I stand for it as the majority of the American people have always stood for it whenever we have had a square vote on it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. PAYNE. I have only two or three minutes. I do not think the gentleman will throw any light on my remarks.

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to ask the gentleman—

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman will excuse me. I decline to yield. Now, Mr. Speaker, having embalmed that fly—I do not

mean to speak disrespectfully of my friend from Alabama. I mean the fly that he was pushing out in this direction. I am for protection, Mr. Speaker, because the greatest prosperity in this country, from the foundation of it down to to-day, has been while we have had a protective tariff that fostered our industries. It has helped everybody. It has helped the wage earner by giving him continuous employment at good wages. It has helped the farmer by giving him a market at his own door. Why, God bless you gentlemen from the West, how do you suppose our farmers in the State of New York would live if it was not for the protective tariff that gives them a market right at their own doors? When you bring your wheat and corn and the products of your farms and sell them against our markets the New York farmer can not make much money on those articles, and he is raising garden stuff and berries and fruits, and everything that he can grow there, and selling them to the people who work for wages which the protective tariff enables them to earn, which in that way gives the farmer a nearby market. Yes, and he has a little advantage, too, when he has a little wheat left over that he can sell for use in the nearby prosperous town. He can get a little better price for it than you can get for yours after you have paid your transportation. And so our farmers live and are prosperous. And out of this magnificent work of the protective tariff that brings prosperity to the people of the United States, a prosperity which comes to no other people under the sun, a prosperity which is recognized by every great statesman of all the nations of the earth, the other nations want a share. So it has happened that no country in the world to-day is without a protective tariff save Great Britain; and even in Great Britain they have so many wharf and dockage charges, and official fees and things of that kind, that they get somewhat of the benefit of protection even without a tariff on protected industries.

So I am for a bill that protects. I wish the Hill bill had been drawn a little more on the line of protection. I wish they had not overlooked the stocking schedule, but had maintained the present duties on stockings, which this Tariff Board report shows were as nearly right as you could make them to-day. That is shown in the evidence presented on page 615 of the board's cotton report. If the gentleman from Connecticut had done that, then he would have had a better bill.

When we come to pass it in the next Congress, or soon after, we will make it ideal all the way through; we will give the Tariff Board a little more time and a little more money to get the exact cost across the water. We are not afraid of the light, we are not afraid of the facts. Turn on the light, and we will make a bill in accordance with the facts and the light that comes to us.

I wish we could have had the light three years ago that we have got now from the Tariff Board. I wish we could have had the benefit of the Tariff Board then. We did the best we could, we worked night and day to get at the facts, but the life of a Congress is too short. Why, the great industries of this country, the work of this country, is so broad, so varied, so magnificent in all its proportions, that the life of a single Congress is not long enough, no matter how diligent men may be, to get all of these facts. When the Democracy comes to settle for the moment with their constituencies they will see it as we do, and once more, as a little over a year ago, we will be unanimous for a Tariff Board in the House and in the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, has the other side consumed all its time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRISON of New York). All the time of the minority has been exhausted. The gentleman from Alabama has 1 hour and 28 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House with an extended argument in reference to this bill. When it was presented to the House a year ago I fully discussed all the details of the bill and it is not necessary to make an extended argument now.

Yesterday, I stated in the Record our conclusions in reference to the report of the Tariff Board. I have been entertained and somewhat amused by the arguments that have been made by the gentlemen on the other side of the House, especially those arguments of my Republican brethren, explaining why they intended to vote for the substitute that will be offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL]. They pride themselves on the fact, and state in the House that the Hill substitute is lower in its rates of duty than the Democratic bill that is presented to the House.

In the first place, I do not think that argument sets in the mouth of the standpat Republicans on that side of the aisle, when it has hardly been two years since they drove through the House the Payne tariff bill, that instead of reducing the rates of duty on the cotton schedule raised the rates of duty. [Ap-

plause on the Democratic side.] When they enacted into law a bill that the first year it became a law levied taxes on the American people under the cotton schedule to the amount of 48 per cent ad valorem and the following year levied rates of duty which amounted to 47 and a fraction per cent ad valorem; that these same gentlemen who to-day say they can not afford to vote for the Democratic tariff bill that only levies taxes on the American people, if it becomes a law, to the extent of 27 per cent ad valorem—that they can not afford to vote for it because they are in favor of a bill that levies a lower rate of duty. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I would not say anything that reflected on the character or the intelligence or the integrity of gentlemen on that side of the House, but when they come before the country with the blood of the Payne tariff bill dripping from their fingers, exacting rates that they to-day admit are exorbitant and murderous to the consuming masses of the American people, and then say, "No; we can not give you tariff relief; we can not afford to vote for the Democratic bill that cuts the rates of that bill nearly in half, because, forsooth, you have not reduced it low enough," they can not expect the American people to take them seriously. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Ah, my friends, do you expect to carry that argument to the American people? Do you expect to get the American people to believe any such argument coming from your lips? I do not; and I do not believe the people of the United States will give faith and credit to the position you are taking in the House to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As a matter of fact, I am glad the gentleman from Connecticut has introduced his bill. It sustains the Democratic position. He may be on some item a point lower than we are and on another item a point higher than we are, but it repudiates the Republican position on the tariff question. When you stand on that side of the House and vote for the bill offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, you will repudiate the position which the President of the United States took yesterday. In his letter accepting the nomination again for the Presidency of the United States, he states to the people that his position in signing the Payne tariff bill has been justified by facts and conditions. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] proposes a bill that he says cuts the cotton schedule in the Payne-Aldrich bill nearly in half. Does that justify the position of the President of the United States in signing the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill? [Applause on the Democratic side.] When you go to your constituents this fall, are you going to stand for the President of the United States or for the gentleman from Connecticut? The President of the United States, in his letter of acceptance, in referring to the tariff work of Congress, said:

On the other hand, our opponents, the Democrats, have presented to me for my signature a woolen bill and a cotton bill, both of which, if allowed to become a law, as the reports of the Tariff Board show, would have made such a radical cut in the rates on many woolen and cotton manufactures as to seriously interfere with those industries in this country. This would have forced the transfer of manufactures to England and Germany and other foreign countries.

That was the Republican position dripping down to Congress from the White House, and yet to-day the gentleman from Connecticut brings an indictment against the Democratic Party because, he says, we have not reduced our rates low enough; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who wrote the Payne bill, says that he is in favor of the substitute proposed by the gentleman from Connecticut because it reduces the rates of duty lower than the Democratic tariff bill. Gentlemen, you may be able to explain this position to some one else, but you can not explain it in that way to me, and I do not think you will be able to explain it to any intelligent American constituency. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There is nothing in the rate of duty that destroys an industry if it does not bring competition. There is nothing that can injure the American manufacturer unless it comes from competition from abroad, and yet we have the Republican Party to-day contending that their bill is at a lower rate and therefore will bring greater competition, and at the same time the President of the United States saying that our bill would bring too much competition, which you say bears higher rates, and because it contains a higher rate and less competition, according to your arguments, we are going to destroy an American industry.

As a matter of fact I showed and demonstrated, to my judgment, in the House last year that the total increase of importations under the cotton schedules, if this bill becomes a law, will amount to but a little over \$10,000,000; that the total consumption of cotton goods in the United States amounts to over \$800,000,000; that if all the goods were admitted under our bill the experts estimate may come into this country, it could not seriously injure any legitimate industry, but it will bring about

some more competition. It certainly wipes out a great many of the prohibitive tariff rates that exist in the Payne-Aldrich law to-day, and, if that is the case, I say that when you voted against this bill last year your votes were not justified; that if Mr. HILL's substitute is voted down and you vote against it to-day you can not justify your votes with the argument that your own side of the House has made [applause on the Democratic side]; that if the Republicans in this House believe that the bill introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut is correct, then the President of the United States can not justify a veto of this bill when it reaches him before this Congress adjourns.

As to the Tariff Board, their report upon this schedule is really lamentable. There is no raw material for them to report upon, because cotton is on the free list. They made some effort to investigate the cost of the yarn and the lower-grade products of the cotton industry. In reference to cloth, they did exactly what they did in the woolen schedule. They submitted samples to manufacturers.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not care to yield at this time. They submitted samples to manufacturers to ascertain from them what the manufacturer said the price should be, and then reported to Congress what conclusion they had come to after the manufacturer had told them. [Applause on the Democratic side.] More than that, as shown by the letters from the President to the Tariff Board, which I printed in the Record yesterday afternoon, they refused to give to the Ways and Means Committee even the information as to who the manufacturers were who told them the facts. The President of the United States challenges our bills and condemns our action, because we do not comply with the report of the Tariff Board, which is no report at all to begin with, and in the second place that same Tariff Board refuses to disclose the material facts on which their report is based. Can any man here deny the fact that it is material for a Ways and Means Committee to know who the witnesses were and how many witnesses they had before the Tariff Board? Were we not entitled to know from what sources they got their information? And yet this board did not dare give to the House of Representatives the information to which we were entitled, and you stand here ready to go to your constituents and justify your position on the report of a Tariff Board that made a report on only two or three items and then refused to disclose to you the sources of information from which they made their report. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, a little while ago I undertook to interrupt the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] when he was discussing the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad and stating that he stood for a tariff based on such a difference, the information to be secured by the Tariff Board; my purpose in rising then was to inform the gentleman that it is absolutely impossible to obtain this information.

In the first place no sensible man is going to acquaint his competitors in the manufacturing business with the secrets of his success in the manufacture of certain goods, nor will he teach his competitor how to successfully compete with him by giving him in detail the knowledge that he has acquired as to the cost and manner of producing certain goods.

About three years ago I read a statement from an American official to the effect that the German Government had issued an edict that the secret processes used in the manufacture of cotton goods should be kept a secret. They should be given to nobody. Especially was it desired that this information be kept from the United States. The German manufacturer did not want the American manufacturer to know these secrets. France and England, I think, guard their manufacturing secrets in the same way, and it is impossible to empower any inquisitorial board to get these facts from the foreign manufacturer. Then how are you going to tell what it costs to produce cotton goods abroad? We can not obtain these facts. This is another effort on the part of the Republican Party to delay and postpone honest tariff revision. That party broke its promise to the American people, violated its platform pledges, and now hides behind a Tariff Board appointed and controlled by the President. Gentlemen, you can not deceive the American people any longer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I agree with what my colleague says, that one of the most difficult problems that confronts any expert board is to ascertain accurately the difference in the cost of production either at home or abroad, or the difference between the cost of productions of domestic manufac-

Mr. BARTHOLOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I really do not care to yield for a question at this point.

Mr. BARTHOLOLT. I merely want to state in reply to what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] says that I happen to know one of the secret agents in Germany, who for the last 10 years has been intrusted with the task of securing from the manufacturers figures as to the cost of their production, and I asked him the question last year at Berlin whether he had ever been refused information that he desired. He said that everywhere, in all the manufacturing concerns that he had occasion to visit, he was received with the greatest courtesy, and that they were entirely willing to give him all the facts and figures—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, I will ask the gentleman to give his informant's name. I would like to ask the gentleman who his witness is.

Mr. BARTHOLOLT. He is one of the confidential agents of the Treasury Department.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What is his name?

Mr. BARTHOLOLT. I am perfectly willing to give his name.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to have it.

Mr. BARTHOLOLT. I will say this, because what he does is done at the request and by direction of the Treasury Department; his name is Mr. Frederick Achenbach.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am glad to get the information.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the gentleman from Alabama will permit me, I got my information from the consular report made by the Government agents abroad. I can not lay my hand on it just now, but I stand by the statement that the German Government has issued an edict—as I stated it was reported—and will not permit anybody connected with the factories that manufacture cotton goods to give the secret processes by which they manufacture and dye those goods; and it is impossible to get the cost of the production of cotton goods in Germany.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not care to pursue that line of argument.

Mr. BARTHOLOLT. If the gentleman will permit, I want to say I did not ask particularly with respect to cotton, but I asked him whether in any instance information had been refused, and he said:

No, sir; they have received me almost with open arms, and gave me everything they knew.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it only shows that this Tariff Board in its report is the more reprehensible not to give to this House the information and the sources of information that it had at its command; but be that as it may, I challenge any man in this House to show that there is any material difference between the Tariff Board report on these items on which it did report and the conclusions reached in the bill that is now presented before us and the House. Of course, there is a broad range of cost prices presented in this report. Some are high in one material and some are low in another, but if you make anything like a reasonable average cost price of the yarns and low-grade products on which the Tariff Board did report, their report justifies the bill that we are presenting to the House to-day, and on those items on which they did not report certainly the President of the United States or gentlemen on that side of the House have no right to complain of us.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] criticized our bills, saying they were drawn without care and that they are a matter of guesswork. But I want to say to the gentleman from New York and other gentlemen on that side of the House that this bill and our other tariff bills were sent to the President of the United States more than a year ago. During that time there never has been an occasion for a Democrat, either in this Congress or out of it, to apologize for the work we have done. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And yet, so far as the bill is concerned that was passed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], so far as the legislation is concerned that that side of the House is responsible for, you came and started to apologize for it before the ink was dry on the paper when the President signed the bill. You had hardly put it into law before you begged an apology from the American people and asked to have some tariff experts, employed without warrant of law, to tell you how to rewrite a tariff bill to take the place of the Payne-Aldrich bill that you admitted you could not justify.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not for one moment believe that the American people misunderstand this proposition. You may becloud it with words and misleading statements, but the fact remains that the American people know that the Payne-Aldrich bill was written in the interest of protective monopoly of the United States [applause on the Democratic side]; that it was dictated by manufacturers, who, many of them, wrung from the American people over 100 per cent by reason of this tariff

wall that you place on the statute books and that your Republican President is maintaining there because of his veto. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are making an earnest effort to repeal that law, to relieve this burden that the American people are suffering from, and we have made so much progress that on our votes in the past on this bill we have received the votes of a large number of Republicans on that side of the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] More than that, on a woolen bill and on a cotton bill, we have been able to secure enough votes in a Republican Senate to send those bills to the President of the United States. When he says that he can not sign these bills he does not point alone to a Democratic House. He points as well to men who sat in the Senate of the United States, holding their commissions from Republican constituencies, who say that the legislation that we have sent to him is justified.

You can not go to your constituency on any false assumption that if you are returned to power you intend to revise the tariff downward. The President of the United States, the standard bearer of your party, took that claim away from you on yesterday. He says that the enactment of the Payne bill into law has been justified. He does not proclaim again to the American people, like he did four years ago, that if he is returned to power he will stand for a revision downward. No, my friends on that side of the House, the President of the United States four years ago was a progressive on the tariff question. He is progressing from stand-pat Republicanism, from the tariff bills of Mr. PAYNE and Mr. DALZIEL and Senator Aldrich, toward the Democratic position of an honest revision in favor of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But he does not stand there to-day. On the tariff question he has gone—horse, foot, and dragoons—into the camp of the Republican stand-pat faction of the party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He is dependent on the stand-pat tariff Republicans for his support in the coming campaign. He is dependent on the Republican stand-pat tariff Republicans for the campaign funds that he will get to run his campaign. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You know that as well as I know it, and by offering the substitute here that you would not dare vote for or pass if you were in power, that you put here as a cloud to befog and befuddle the American people, you can not avoid the issue. Your candidate for President four years ago, as I stated, was moving toward an honest revision of the tariff. To-day he has returned to the camp of the enemy, and if you elect him to power next November there will be no honest revision of the tariff [applause on the Democratic side], and the great trusts and tariff barons in this country will once more, for four long years, stand behind the protective-tariff wall of the Payne tariff bill. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

I ask for a vote on the question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a substitute for the pending bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURLEY). The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] offers a substitute for the pending bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting, in lieu of the matter stricken out, the following:

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I will ask, unless any Member desires to have it read through, that the reading of the substitute be dispensed with, in view of the fact that it has already been distributed among the Members.

Mr. PAYNE. It has not been read in the House?

Mr. HILL. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting, in lieu of the matter stricken out, the following:

"That the act entitled 'An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved August 5, 1909, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out all of the paragraphs of Schedule I of section 1 of said act from 313 to 332, inclusive of both, and inserting in place thereof the following:

"1. Cotton card laps, sliver, roving, or roping, 5 per cent ad valorem.

"2. Cotton waste and flocks manufactured, 10 per cent ad valorem; antiseptic, medicated, or sterilized cotton, cotton waste, or flocks, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"3. Cotton yarns in the gray, or otherwise, not advanced beyond the condition of singles, by grouping or twisting two or more single yarns together, not exceeding No. 40, $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent ad valorem.

"Exceeding No. 40, and not exceeding No. 80, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"Exceeding No. 80, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"4. Cotton yarn or thread not otherwise provided for, in the gray or otherwise, advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more single yarns together; and cable laid yarns or threads, in the gray, or otherwise, made by grouping or twisting two or more twisted yarns or threads together, shall be subject to the

same rates of duty as the single yarns from which they are made, and in addition thereto 5 per cent ad valorem.

"Spool thread of cotton, crochet, darning, and embroidery cottons, on spools, shall be dutiable at the same rates of duty as the single yarns from which they are made.

"5. Cotton cloth, plain woven, in the grey, or bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, mercerized, or otherwise finished, containing not more than 5 square yards to the pound, 5 per cent ad valorem;

"Containing more than 5 and not more than $7\frac{1}{2}$ square yards to the pound, 10 per cent ad valorem;

"Containing more than $7\frac{1}{2}$ square yards to the pound, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"6. Cotton cloth, fancy woven, in the grey, or bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, mercerized, or otherwise finished, containing figures produced by various weaving devices known as dobby, drop-box, leno, lappet, swivel, or any other name except Jacquard, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"7. Cotton cloth woven by means of the Jacquard attachment, not otherwise provided for, 25 per cent ad valorem.

"Cotton table damask, 25 per cent ad valorem; manufactures of cotton table damask, or of which cotton table damask is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem.

"8. Cloths containing silk or artificial silk, in which cotton is the component material of chief value, shall be subject to the same rates of duty as cotton cloths of similar weave, and in addition thereto 5 per cent ad valorem.

"9. Cotton cloths filled or coated, in whole or in part, including oil-cloth of cotton, waterproof cloths composed of cotton or in which cotton is the component material of chief value, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"10. Handkerchiefs or mufflers of cotton, in the piece or otherwise, finished or unfinished, hemstitched or not, not otherwise specially provided for, shall pay the same rate of duty as the cloth of which they are made, and in addition thereto 5 per cent ad valorem.

"11. Plushes, velvets, velveteens, corduroys, and all pile fabrics made of cotton, of which cotton is the component material of chief value, whether the pile covers the entire surface or not:

"Uncut, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"Cut, in whole or in part, 40 per cent ad valorem.

"Provided, That manufactures or articles in any form, including such as are commonly known as bias dress facings or skirt bindings, made or cut from plushes, velvets, or other pile fabrics composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, shall be subject to the same rates of duty as the fabrics from which they are made.

"12. Curtains, table covers, and all articles manufactured of cotton chenille, or of which cotton chenille is the component material of chief value; cotton reps, Jacquard figured tapestry and Jacquard figured upholstery goods, weighing over 6 ounces per square yard, made of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 40 per cent ad valorem.

"13. Stockings, hose, and half hose, made wholly or in part on knitting machines or frames, commercially known as seamless, composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"14. Stockings, hose, or half hose, made wholly or in part on knitting machines or frames or knit by hand and commercially known as full-fashioned, composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, valued at not more than \$2 per dozen pairs, 50 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than \$2 per dozen pairs, 60 per cent ad valorem.

"15. Shirts and drawers, pants, vests, union suits, combination suits, tights, sweaters, corset covers, and all underwear of every description, made wholly or in part on knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, finished or unfinished, not otherwise provided for, composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, valued at not more than \$1.50 per dozen garments, 20 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than \$1.50 per dozen garments and not more than \$3 per dozen garments, 30 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than \$3 per dozen garments and not more than \$6 per dozen garments, 40 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than \$6 per dozen garments, 45 per cent ad valorem.

"16. Men's and boys' gloves, knitted or woven, composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 50 per cent ad valorem.

"17. Tire fabric or fabric suitable for use in pneumatic tires, made of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 25 per cent ad valorem.

"18. Bone casings, garters, suspenders and braces, webs, webbings, and tubing, any of the foregoing composed wholly or in chief value of cotton, or of cotton and India rubber, and not embroidered by hand or machinery; spindle banding, woven, braided, or twisted lamp, stove, or candle wicking, loom harness, healds or collets, boot, shoe, and corset lacings, labels for garments or other articles; composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 30 per cent ad valorem.

"Belt for machinery made of cotton and India rubber, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"19. Clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, wholly or partly manufactured, not specially provided for, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton, 30 per cent ad valorem.

"20. All articles made from cotton cloth, and all manufactures of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for, 30 per cent ad valorem.

"21. The term cotton cloth wherever used in the paragraphs of this schedule, unless otherwise specially provided, shall be held to include all woven fabrics composed wholly or in chief value of cotton, in the piece or cut in lengths, and shall not include any article finished, or unfinished, made from cotton cloth.

"SEC. 2. That the last clause of paragraph 347 of said act of August 5, 1909, is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"'Waterproof cloth composed of vegetable fiber other than cotton, whether composed in part of India rubber or otherwise, 10 cents per square yard and 20 per cent ad valorem.'

"SEC. 3. That paragraph 347 of said act of August 5, 1909, is hereby amended by adding the following proviso: 'Provided, That none of the foregoing shall apply to coated or filled cotton cloth, or articles made therefrom.'

"SEC. 4. That paragraph 348 of said act of August 5, 1909, is hereby amended so as to read as follows: 'Shirt collars and cuffs, composed of linen, or of which linen is the component material of chief value, 40 cents per dozen pieces and 20 per cent ad valorem.'

"SEC. 5. That paragraph 349 of said act of August 5, 1909, is hereby amended by striking out therefrom the words 'webs and webbings.'

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the substitute as reported.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the substitute as reported by the Clerk.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, has that question been stated?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes. Those in favor of the substitute as reported by the Clerk will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed "nay."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MANN. It takes 196 to make a quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-one Members are present—less than a quorum. A call of the House is ordered. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANN. Will the Speaker state the question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members in favor of the substitute as reported by the Clerk will vote "yea"; those opposed "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 86, nays 147, answered "present" 8, not voting 149, as follows:

YEAS—86.

Akin, N. Y.	Gardner, N. J.	La Follette	Sloan
Anderson, Minn.	Good	Lenroot	Steenerson
Barchfeld	Green, Iowa	Lindbergh	Stephens, Cal.
Bartholdt	Guernsey	Longworth	Sterling
Bates	Hanna	McKinney	Stevens, Minn.
Berger	Hartman	McLaughlin	Sulloway
Bowman	Haugen	Mann	Switzer
Browning	Hawley	Miller	Taylor, Ohio
Burke, S. Dak.	Heald	Mondell	Tilson
Catlin	Helgesen	Morse, Wis.	Towner
Copley	Hill	Mott	Utter
Crago	Howell	Needham	Volstead
Crumpacker	Howland	Norris	Warburton
Curry	Hughes, W. Va.	Patton, Pa.	Wedemeyer
Danforth	Humphrey, Wash.	Payne	Willis
Davis, Minn.	Kahn	Pickett	Wilson, Ill.
Donohoe	Kendall	Plumley	Wood, N. J.
Farr	Kennedy	Pray	Woods, Iowa
Foss	Kent	Prouty	Young, Kans.
French	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Rees	Young, Mich.
Fuller	Knowland	Roberts, Mass.	
Gardner, Mass.	Lafferty	Rodenberg	

NAYS—147.

Adair	Dickinson	Holland	Raker
Adamson	Dixon, Ind.	Houston	Ransdell, La.
Alexander	Doremus	Howard	Rauch
Allen	Doughton	Hughes, N. J.	Reilly
Ames	Driscoll, D. A.	Hull	Robinson
Anderson, Ohio	Estopinal	Humphreys, Miss.	Rouse
Ansberry	Evans	Jacoway	Rubey
Ashbrook	Ferguson	Johnson, Ky.	Russell
Austin	Finley	Kitchen	Sabath
Ayres	Flood, Va.	Korbly	Scully
Bathrick	Floyd, Ark.	Lee, Ga.	Shackelford
Beall, Tex.	Foster	Lee, Pa.	Sharp
Blackmon	Fowler	Lever	Sims
Boehne	Francis	Levy	Sisson
Brantley	Gallagher	Linthicum	Slayden
Broussard	George	Littlepage	Small
Brown	Godwin, N. C.	Lloyd	Smith, Tex.
Buchanan	Goeke	Lobeck	Stanley
Bulkeley	Goldfogle	McCoy	Stedman
Burke, Wis.	Goodwin, Ark.	McDermott	Stephens, Nebr.
Burleson	Graham	McGillcuddy	Stephens, Tex.
Burnett	Gray	McKellar	Stone
Byrns, Tenn.	Greene, Mass.	Maguire, Nebr.	Sweet
Candler	Gregg, Pa.	Martin, Colo.	Taggart
Carlin	Gregg, Tex.	Morrison	Talcott, N. Y.
Carter	Gudger	Moss, Ind.	Taylor, Colo.
Claypool	Hamill	Murray	Thayer
Cline	Hamlin	Neeley	Townsend
Connell	Hammond	Oldfield	Tribble
Conry	Hardy	O'Shaunessy	Underhill
Cox, Ind.	Harrison, Miss.	Padgett	Underwood
Cravens	Harrison, N. Y.	Page	Watkins
Cullop	Hay	Palmer	White
Curley	Hayden	Pepper	Wilson, Pa.
Davis, W. Va.	Hedlin	Post	Witherspoon
Dent	Henry, Tex.	Pou	The Speaker
Denver	Hensley	Rainey	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8.

Burgess	Draper	Johnson, S. C.	Sparkman
Butler	Driscoll, M. E.	McMorran	Sulzer

NOT VOTING—149.

Aiken, S. C.	Booher	Campbell	Cooper
Ainey	Borland	Cannon	Covington
Andrus	Bradley	Cantrill	Cox, Ohio
Anthony	Burke, Pa.	Cary	Currier
Barnhart	Byrnes, S. C.	Clark, Fla.	Dalzell
Bartlett	Calder	Clayton	Daugherty
Bell, Ga.	Callaway	Collier	Davenport

Davidson	Helm	Madden	Saunders
De Forest	Henry, Conn.	Maher	Sells
Dickson, Miss.	Higgins	Martin, S. Dak.	Sheppard
Dies	Hinds	Matthews	Sherley
Difenderfer	Hobson	Mays	Sherwood
Dodds	Hughes, Ga.	Moon, Pa.	Simmons
Dupré	Jackson	Moon, Tenn.	Slomp
Dwight	James	Moore, Pa.	Smith, J. M. C.
Eder	Jones	Moore, Tex.	Smith, Saml. W.
Edwards	Kindred	Morgan	Smith, Cal.
Ellerbe	Kinkaid, N. J.	Murdock	Smith, N. Y.
Esch	Konig	Nelson	Speer
Fairchild	Konop	Nye	Stack
Faison	Kopp	Olmsted	Stephens, Miss.
Ferris	Lafean	Parran	Talbott, Md.
Fields	Lamb	Patten, N. Y.	Taylor, Ala.
Fitzgerald	Langham	Peters	Thistlewood
Focht	Langley	Porter	Thomas
Fordney	Lawrence	Powers	Turnbull
Fornes	Legare	Prince	Tuttle
Garner	Lewis	Pujo	Vare
Garrett	Lindsay	Randell, Tex.	Vreeland
Gillett	Littleton	Redfield	Webb
Glass	Loud	Reyburn	Weeks
Gould	McCall	Richardson	Whitacre
Griest	McCreary	Riordan	Wilder
Hamilton, Mich.	McGuire, Okla.	Roberts, Nev.	Wilson, N. Y.
Hamilton, W. Va.	McHenry	Roddenbery	Young, Tex.
Hardwick	McKenzie	Rothermel	
Harris	McKinley	Rucker, Colo.	
Hayes	Macon	Rucker, Mo.	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he voted "no."

So Mr. HILL's substitute was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. BURGESS with Mr. WEEKS.

Mr. FORTNE with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Until further notice:

Mr. COX of Ohio with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. SIMMONS.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PUJO with Mr. McMORRAN.

Mr. CLAYTON with Mr. LAFFAN.

Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. LAMB with Mr. FOCHT.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. PARRAN.

Mr. PETERS with Mr. McCALL.

Mr. LITTLETON with Mr. DWIGHT.

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.

Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. REDFIELD with Mr. SPEER.

Mr. JAMES with Mr. CANNON.

Mr. ELLERBE with Mr. CURRIER.

Mr. MAYS with Mr. THISTLEWOOD.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. DALZELL.

Mr. RANDALL of Texas with Mr. SMITH of California.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri with Mr. DYER.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. GARRETT with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. HARDWICK with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. LEGARE with Mr. LOUD.

Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. OLMSTED.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. PRINCE.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. SULZER with Mr. MATTHEWS.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi with Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota.

Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. WILDER.

Mr. SHEPPARD with Mr. VREELAND.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado with Mr. J. M. C. SMITH.

Mr. RODDENBERY with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICHARDSON with Mr. REYBURN.

Mr. KONOP with Mr. McKINLEY.

Mr. KINKAD of New Jersey with Mr. McKENZIE.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia with Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina with Mr. GILLETT.

Mr. GARNER with Mr. McCREARY.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. HINDS.

Mr. FAISON with Mr. LAWRENCE.

Mr. DUPRE with Mr. KOPP.

Mr. DIFENDERFER with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. DIES with Mr. HIGGINS.

Mr. COVINGTON with Mr. HENRY of Connecticut.

Mr. COLLIER with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL.
Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. DODDS.
Mr. BOOHER with Mr. DE FOREST.
Mr. BARNHART with Mr. CALDER.
Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

From July 27 for the balance of the session:

Mr. TURNBULL with Mr. HAYES.

From Thursday for the balance of the session:

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. LANGHAM.

Until August 28:

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina with Mr. MADDEN.

On this vote:

Mr. WILSON of New York (against the substitute) with Mr. JACKSON (in favor of the substitute).

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I voted "no," but being paired with the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. DAVIDSON, I desire to be recorded as present.

Mr. BUTLER. I voted for this substitute, but as I am paired with the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BARTLETT, who is out of the city, I desire to be recorded as present.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum being present, further proceedings under the call are vacated. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MANN. On that I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 158, nays 72, answered "present" 9, not voting 151, as follows:

YEAS—158.

Adair	Driscoll, D. A.	Hull	Ransdell, La.
Adamson	Estopinal	Humphreys, Miss.	Rauch
Akin, N. Y.	Evans	Jacoway	Reilly
Alexander	Fergusson	Johnson, Ky.	Robinson
Allen	Finley	Kent	Rouse
Anderson, Minn.	Flood, Va.	Kitchin	Rubey
Anderson, Ohio	Floyd, Ark.	Konig	Russell
Ansberry	Foster	Korbly	Sabath
Ashbrook	Fowler	Lafferty	Saunders
Ayres	Francis	La Follette	Scully
Beall, Tex.	French	Lee, Pa.	Shackelford
Berger	Gallagher	Lenroot	Sharp
Blackmon	George	Lever	Sims
Boehne	Godwin, N. C.	Levy	Sisson
Brantley	Goeke	Lindbergh	Slayden
Brown	Goldfogle	Linthicum	Small
Buchanan	Goodwin, Ark.	Littlepage	Smith, Tex.
Bulkley	Graham	Lloyd	Stanley
Burke, Wis.	Gray	Lobeck	Stedman
Burleson	Gregg, Pa.	McCoy	Stephens, Cal.
Burnett	Gregg, Tex.	McDermott	Stephens, Nebr.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Gudger	McGillicuddy	Stephens, Tex.
Candler	Hamill	McKellar	Stone
Carter	Hamlin	Maguire, Nebr.	Sweet
Claypool	Hammond	Martin, Colo.	Taylor, Colo.
Cline	Hanna	Morrison	Thayer
Connell	Hardy	Morse, Wis.	Townsend
Conry	Harrison, Miss.	Moss, Ind.	Tribble
Cox, Ind.	Harrison, N. Y.	Murray	Underhill
Cravens	Haugen	Neeley	Underwood
Cullop	Hay	Norris	Warburton
Curley	Hayden	Oldfield	Watkins
Davis, Minn.	Hellin	O'Shaunessy	White
Davis, W. Va.	Helgesen	Padgett	Wilson, Pa.
Dent	Henry, Tex.	Page	Witherspoon
Denver	Hensley	Palmer	Woods, Iowa
Dickinson	Holland	Pepper	Young, Kans.
Dixon, Ind.	Houston	Pou	The Speaker
Doremus	Howard	Rainey	
Doughton	Hughes, N. J.	Rakér	

NAYS—72.

Ames	Gardner, Mass.	Knowland	Rosenberg
Austin	Gardner, N. J.	Longworth	Simmons
Barchfeld	Good	McKinney	Sloan
Bartholdt	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin	Steenerson
Bates	Greene, Mass.	Mann	Sterling
Bowman	Guernsey	Miller	Stevens, Minn.
Browning	Hartman	Mondell	Sulloway
Burke, S. Dak.	Hawley	Mott	Switzer
Catlin	Heald	Needham	Taylor, Ohio
Copley	Hill	Patton, Pa.	Tilson
Crago	Howell	Payne	Towner
Curry	Howland	Pickett	Utter
Danforth	Hughes, W. Va.	Plumley	Volstead
De Forest	Humphrey, Wash.	Pray	Wedemeyer
Draper	Kahn	Prince	Willis
Farr	Kendall	Prouty	Wilson, Ill.
Foss	Kennedy	Rees	Wood, N. J.
Fuller	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Roberts, Mass.	Young, Mich.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9.

Burgess	Johnson, S. C.	McMorran	Sparkman
Butler	Lee, Ga.	Peters	Sulzer
Driscoll, M. E.			

NOT VOTING—151.

Aiken, S. C.	Dupré	Lafean	Redfield
Ainey	Dwight	Lamb	Reynolds
Andrus	Dyer	Langham	Richardson
Anthony	Edwards	Langley	Riordan
Barnhart	Ellerbe	Lawrence	Roberts, Nev.
Bartlett	Esch	Legare	Roddenberry
Bathrick	Fairchild	Lewis	Rothermel
Bell, Ga.	Faison	Lindsay	Rucker, Colo.
Booher	Ferris	Littleton	Rucker, Mo.
Borland	Fields	Loud	Sells
Bradley	Fitzgerald	McCall	Sheppard
Broussard	Focht	McCreary	Sherley
Burke, Pa.	Fordney	McGuire, Okla.	Sherwood
Byrnes, S. C.	Fornes	McHenry	Slemp
Calder	Garner	McKenzie	Smith, J. M. C.
Callaway	Garrett	McKinley	Smith, Saml. W.
Campbell	Gillett	Macon	Smith, Cal.
Cannon	Glass	Madden	Smith, N. Y.
Cantrill	Gould	Maher	Speer
Carlin	Griest	Martin, S. Dak.	Stack
Cary	Hamilton, Mich.	Matthews	Stephens, Miss.
Clark, Fla.	Hamilton, W. Va.	Mays	Taggart
Clayton	Hardwick	Moon, Pa.	Talbott, Md.
Collier	Harris	Moon, Tenn.	Talcott, N. Y.
Cooper	Hayes	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Ala.
Covington	Helm	Moore, Tex.	Thistlewood
Cox, Ohio	Henry, Conn.	Morgan	Thomas
Crumpacker	Higgins	Murdock	Turnbull
Currer	Hinds	Nelson	Tuttle
Dalzell	Hobson	Nye	Vare
Daugherty	Hughes, Ga.	Olmsted	Vreeland
Davenport	Jackson	Parran	Webb
Davidson	James	Patten, N. Y.	Weeks
Dickson, Miss.	Jones	Porter	Whitacre
Dies	Kindred	Post	Wilder
Difenderfer	Kinhead, N. J.	Powers	Wilson, N. Y.
Dodds	Konop	Pujo	Young, Tex.
Donohoe	Kopp	Randell, Tex.	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he answered "aye," as above recorded.

So the bill was passed.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. BATHRICK with Mr. CRUMPACKER.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. HARRIS.

Mr. DONOHUE with Mr. VARE.

The result of the vote was then announced, as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On July 27, 1912:

H. R. 11628. An act authorizing John T. McCrosson and associates to construct an irrigation ditch on the island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 644. An act for the relief of Mary E. Quinn;

H. R. 22043. An act to authorize additional aids to navigation in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 24699. An act extending the time for the repayment of certain war-revenue taxes erroneously collected.

On July 30, 1912:

H. R. 1739. An act to amend section 4875 of the Revised Statutes, to provide a compensation for superintendents of national cemeteries;

H. R. 13938. An act for the relief of Theodore Salus; and

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution making appropriation to be used in exterminating the army worm.

On July 31, 1912:

H. R. 4012. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands with the State of Michigan;

H. R. 12375. An act authorizing Daniel W. Abbott to make homestead entry;

H. R. 22111. An act for the relief of the Delaware Transportation Co., owner of the American steamer *Dorothy*; and

H. R. 24598. An act for the relief of Jesus Silva, jr.

On August 1, 1912:

H. R. 25598. An act granting a pension to Cornelia C. Bragg;

H. R. 18041. An act granting a franchise for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a street railway system in the district of South Hilo, county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 18033. An act to modify and amend the mining laws in their application to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 344. Joint resolution to continue the provisions of a joint resolution approved July 1, 1912, entitled "Joint resolution extending appropriations for the necessary operations of the Government under certain contingencies."

On August 2, 1912:

H. R. 16518. An act for the relief of the Fifth-Third National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio; and

H. R. 20873. An act for the relief of J. M. H. Mellon, James A. Mellon, Thomas D. Mellon, Mrs. E. L. Siverd, J. M. H. Mellon, Bessie Blue, Mrs. Simpson, Annie Turley, C. B. Eyler, Luella C. Pearce, John McCracken, A. J. Mellon, J. J. Martin, Eugene Richmond, Springdale Methodist Episcopal Church, Heidekamp Mirror Co., James P. Confer, Jr., W. P. Bigley, W. J. Bole, and S. A. Moyer, all of Allegheny County, Pa.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. There is a conference report on the legislative bill, a conference report on the wool bill, and I would like to get through both reports and not keep the House to too late an hour to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF CLAIMS GROWING OUT OF LATE INSURRECTION IN MEXICO.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate joint resolution 103, now on the Speaker's table, be taken from the table and laid before the House for present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that Senate joint resolution 103 be taken from the Speaker's table and laid before the House for present consideration. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I ask to have the resolution reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) directing the Secretary of State to investigate claims of American citizens growing out of the late insurrection in Mexico, to determine the amounts due, if any, and to press them for payment.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to make, or cause to be made under his direction, a full and thorough investigation of each and all claims of American citizens and of persons domiciled in the United States which may be called to his attention by claimants or their attorneys for damages for injuries to their persons or property, received by them or by those of whom claimants may be the legal representatives, within the boundaries of the United States, by means of gunshot wounds or otherwise inflicted by Mexican Federal or insurgent troops during the late insurrection in Mexico in the year 1911.

For the purpose of such investigation the Secretary of War is authorized to appoint a commission of three officers of the Army, one of whom shall be an inspector general. Such commission shall have authority to subpoena witnesses, administer oaths, and to take evidence on oath relating to any such claim and to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books and papers in any such proceeding by application to the district court of the United States for the district within which any session of the commission is held, which court is hereby empowered and directed to make all orders and issue all processes necessary for that purpose, and said commission shall have all the powers conferred by law upon inspectors general of the United States Army in the performance of their duties. Such commission shall report to Congress, through the Secretary of War, as soon as practicable, its findings of fact upon each and all the claims presented to it and its conclusion as to the justice and equity thereof and as to the proper amount of compensation or indemnity thereupon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SMITH of Texas, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent a similar House joint resolution, No. 255, now on the calendar, was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned to meet to-morrow, Saturday, August 3, 1912, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Quartermaster General of the Army submitting a detailed report and statements of receipts and expenditures as provided for in the fortifications appropriation bill approved August 1, 1904 (H. Doc. No. 895); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the claims of Edgar Allan, Jr., postmaster at Richmond, Va. (H. Doc. No. 894); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, acknowledging receipt of House resolution 578, in regard to high price of anthracite coal (H. Doc. No. 896); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolution were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 23627) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the examination of certain officers of the Army, and to regulate promotions therein," approved October 1, 1890, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1126), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5808) granting right of way across Port Discovery Bay United States Military Reservation to the Seattle, Port Angeles & Lake Crescent Railway, of the State of Washington, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1128), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3010) to fix the requirements governing the receipt, transmission, delivery, and preservation of messages of interstate telegraph and telephone companies, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1129), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCCOY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4718) to authorize the use of certain unclaimed moneys now in the registry of the United States Circuit Court for the Northern District of Ohio for the improvement of the libraries of the United States courts for said district, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1131), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 26097) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Conway, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEVY: A bill (H. R. 26098) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to use at his discretion the moneys in the general fund of the Treasury which at the close of the fiscal year are in excess of \$125,000,000 for the purpose of reducing the tariff on certain necessities of life; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 26099) authorizing the towns of Ball Bluff, Libby, and Cornish, in the county of Aitkin, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in Aitkin County, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26100) conveying certain lands to the T. R. Foley Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota: Resolution (H. Res. 657) asking the Secretary of Agriculture for information relative to the definition of beer and the labeling, branding, or misbranding thereof and for copies of papers relating thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOSS: Resolution (H. Res. 658) regarding the sanitation of the cities of the island of Cuba; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HULL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 345) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 346) to correct an error in H. R. 21230; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 26101) granting a pension to Lizzie Nichols Wood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 26102) for the relief of the city of New York; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 26103) to amend and correct the military record of Henry H. Willis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 26104) for the relief of Loren W. Greeno; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 26105) granting an increase of pension to Isaac V. Vossman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 26106) for the relief of the heirs at law of Bartlett Baker and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 26107) granting an increase of pension to Michael Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 26108) for the relief of Patrick H. Murphy, alias Henry Watson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 26109) granting an increase of pension to William Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 26110) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Hillis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 26111) granting an increase of pension to Daniel K. Gillett; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Washington Camp, No. 22, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Berkeley Springs, W. Va., favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. AYRES: Memorial of the National Association of Talking-Machine Jobbers, of Pittsburgh, Pa., against passage of the Oldfield bill; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of E. C. Rouse, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of House bill 22589, providing for embassy buildings abroad; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Committee on Railway Mail Pay, of New York City, against changing basis for railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of the National Association of Talking-Machine Jobbers, of Pittsburgh, Pa., against passage of the Oldfield bill; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Inventors' Guild of New York City, favoring the creation of a patent commission; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, memorial of the Committee on Railway Mail Pay, against changes in the basis for railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of W. Atlee Burpee, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of the Sulzer parcel-post bill (H. R. 26006); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PARRAN: Memorial of Keystone Council, No. 11, Order of Independent Americans, of Manayunk, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 25309, requiring the flag of the United States to be displayed on all lighthouses of the United States and insular possessions; to the Committee on International and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRAY: Memorial of the Grand Commandery, Knights Templar, of Montana, favoring passage of House joint resolution 271, permitting emblems or insignia to be inscribed on monuments, tombstones, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the Committee on Railway Mail Pay, of New York City, against changing the basis for railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the National Association of Talking Machine Jobbers, of Pittsburgh, Pa., against passage of the Oldfield bill (H. R. 23417); to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of citizens of the State of Nebraska, favoring prohibiting sectarian garb in Indian schools; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the Committee on Railway Mail Pay, against changing the basis for railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the National Association of Talking Machine Jobbers, of Pittsburgh, Pa., against passage of the Oldfield bill, proposing change in patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of De Cappel & Doremus, of New York City, favoring passage of bill to provide additional aids to navigation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TILSON: Memorial of the National Association of Talking Machine Jobbers, of Pittsburgh, Pa., against passage of the Oldfield bill; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Memorial of the National Association of Talking Machine Jobbers, of Pittsburgh, Pa., against passage of the Oldfield bill, proposing change in patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, August 3, 1912.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

Mr. BACON took the chair as President pro tempore under the previous order of the Senate.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION (S. DOC. NO. 893).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Attorney General, submitting an item for inclusion in the general deficiency appropriation bill authorizing the disbursing clerk of the Department of Justice to pay from the appropriation for "salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals, United States courts, 1912," the salary of Creighton M. Foraker for acting as United States marshal, and W. R. Forbes for acting as chief office deputy marshal, from January 7 to March 1, 1912, the interim being between the admission of the Territory of New Mexico to statehood and the appointment of a marshal by the court, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) directing the Secretary of State to investigate the claims of American citizens growing out of the late insurrection in Mexico, to determine the amounts due, if any, and to press them for payment.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 25034) to reduce the duties on manufactures of cotton, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MEMORIAL.

Mr. KERN presented a memorial of members of the Business Men's Association of Lebanon, Ind., remonstrating against the passage of the proposed parcel-post bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BRISTOW, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 606) for the relief of John Treffelsen, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1009) thereon.

Mr. HITCHCOCK, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19190) for the relief of John P. Risley, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1010) thereon.

Mr. DILLINGHAM, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which was referred the bill (S. 3315) to prohibit corporations from making contributions in connection with political elections and to limit the amount of such contributions by individuals or persons, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1011) thereon.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON HYGIENE AND DEMOGRAPHY.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 126) authorizing Federal bureaus doing hygienic and demographic work to participate in the exhibition to be held in connection with the Fifteenth International Congress on Hygiene and Demography, to be held at Washington, September 16 to October 4, 1912. I ask the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] to the reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. After the joint resolution has been read, I will ask unanimous consent for its consideration. I think there will be no objection to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL INTRODUCED.

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 7419) increasing the limit of cost of the post-office building at St. Petersburg, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.